HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XXXII JULY, 1939 NUMBER 3

INSCRIPTIONS RELATING TO SACRAL MANUMISSION AND CONFESSION

A. CAMERON
UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

1

'Αθηνᾶ 12,1900, pp. 70 ff., No. 10.[1] Edessa. 243 A.D.

Ἔτους ϛρτ' μηνὸς
Δίου. Στραττὼ δούλη
θεᾶς ἀνικήτου Μᾶς
καταγράφω ἀμπέλων
5. [πλ]έθρα δύο πλεῖον ἢ ἐ-
[φ' ὅσ]ον τότ[ε] μακρῷ
[. . . . . σα? . .]

This inscription of Edessa is of some importance for the problem of sacral manumission, since Latte (Heiliges Recht, pp. 103 ff.) has made it the basis of far-reaching conclusions with regard to the social and economic position of persons 'dedicated' to the goddess Mâ ἀνίκητος. Latte's results have in turn been adopted by Oppermann in his article on Apollo Lairbenos (R.-E. Suppl. V, col. 521 ff.) and used to interpret the important series of texts from the sanctuary of that god, to which corrections and additions have been made in M.A.M.A. IV, pp. 95 ff. The documents from Edessa[2] to which reference

[1] See also B.P.W. 1899, col. 636, No. 9; R.E.G. XII, 1899, p. 172, No. IX. Though from the same source, the texts differ in some respects: L. 2, Στρ[α]τὴ R.E.G.; Στρ[α]τὼ B.P.W. L. 5, ΠΛΕΙΟΝΚΕ R.E.G.; πλειονηε- B.P.W.

[2] The texts published by Papageorgiou in 'Αθηνᾶ and B.P.W. and by Contoléon in R.E.G. were revised by Pelekides in 'Αρχ. Δελτ. 8, 1923 (1925), pp. 265 ff. According to Pelekides stone Γ fits exactly to B, so that Papageorgiou's No. 11 is the continuation of No. 8. Pelekides adds also (p. 267) a new fragment of some interest. My friend Mr. J. M. R. Cormack of the University of Reading, England, to whom I am indebted for information on the inscriptions of Edessa, visited the Λόγγος in 1936 and was able to revise the texts of A, which then stood in the bed of a stream partly submerged by flood water; stones B and Γ were not to be

will be made are dated from 214 A.D. to 265 A.D. and those of the Lairbenos sanctuary are roughly contemporary.

Rightly rejecting the supplement in line 6 as unintelligible Latte proposes to read

5. [πλ]έθρα δύο πλεῖον ἢ ἔ-
[λαβ]ον, τὸ [τῷ] μακρῷ (?).

This restoration is based on the theory that Stratto as a dependant of the temple had received an allotment of land and that she had brought two further *plethra* into cultivation. This addition was to the advantage of the god as proprietor, so that it might in some sense be regarded as a gift and therefore be recorded as a dedication. The further conclusion is then drawn that for the cultivation of this land laborers would be required, so that we arrive at the picture of a kind of feudal system (p. 105), under which temple estates are cultivated by persons bound to its service who in their turn have dependents of their own. The particular circumstances postulated by Latte are not only somewhat improbable in themselves but the traces in lines 5 and 6 point to a simpler and more convincing restoration. In the papyri, when the area of a piece of land is specified, a safeguarding clause in the form ἀρο(υρῶν) πέντε ἢ ὅσαι ἐὰν ὦσιν ἐπὶ τὸ [πλ]ἔ̣ο̣(ν) ἢ ἔλαττον (B.G.U. 1158) is commonly added.[3] This analogy points with certainty to the restoration

5. [πλ]έθρα δύο πλεῖον ἢ ἔ-
[λατ]τον.

The last words of line 6, as Latte suggests, may have been a description of the situation of the vineyard. They cannot be restored with certainty, but the enigmatic τότ[ε] may perhaps conceal the word τόπος.[4]

---

found. Another dedication (Μητρὶ θεῶν) from Edessa is published in Dareste, Recueil des Inscriptions jur. gr. II, p. 249, No. 13. Similar documents are known from Beroea (A.B.S. XVIII, 1911–1912, p. 139, No. 2; Ἀρχ. Δελτ. II, pp. 145 and 147) and from Scydra (Dareste, op. cit., p. 250, No. 14; B.C.H. XLVII, 1923, p. 182). The Edessa inscriptions are reprinted and discussed in W. Baege, De Macedonum Sacris, 1913, pp. 113 ff.

[3] Preisigke, Wörterbuch, s.v. ἐλάσσων.

[4] Ibid., Abschnitt 23.

The inscription thus restored invites a fresh interpretation. If our reading is correct, one of the two props of Latte's theory falls to the ground; there remains to support it the designation of Stratto as slave of the goddess, which at first sight may seem to prove that she is a slave of the temple and bound to its service. The language and the epigraphic context, however, suggest that, though the inscription is unique among the documents from Edessa and the Lairbenos sanctuary in recording the 'dedication' of a piece of land and not that of a slave, we should take the more numerous manumission records into account in our interpretation. It will be necessary therefore, before reaching a conclusion on the status of Stratto and the nature of the 'dedication,' to review the evidence of the other documents of the group.

The words used for the 'dedication' of a slave at Edessa[5] are χαρίζομαι (1, ἐχαρισόμην; 2, χαρίζεται; 8, ἐχαρισάμην; Dareste, op. cit., p. 249, No. 13, ἐχαρίσατο), δωροῦμαι (5, 6, δωροῦμε; 9, δωροῦνται; 12, ἐδωρησάμην) and the double form ἐδώρησε καὶ κατέγραψεν (3). These terms χαρίζομαι and δωροῦμαι suggest dedication in the strict sense, but we must reckon with the possibility that language appropriate to dedication was used even when the real purpose of the act was not simply to convey a slave from the ownership of the dedicator to that of the god. This view seems to be confirmed by other elements in the texts. In No. 1, for example, the 'dedicator,' Kleopatra, is a Roman citizen with the *ius trium liberorum* (ἔχουσα τριῶν τέκνων δίκην). If her mention of this qualification is not a mere matter of pride, it may have a legal point in regard to *tutela*;[6] but elsewhere we find women acting without any mention of a κύριος (Nos. 2, 3, 12) and the point cannot be stressed as showing a legal rather than a religious character in the document. The secular element, however, is prominent in the conditions attached to the dedication. The slave is to support his mistress (ἐφ' ὅσον τε ζώω ἀπὸ ἑαυτο⟨ῦ⟩ με τραφῆνε) and remain with her till her death

[5] The references are to the numbers in Ἀθηνᾶ, loc. cit.

[6] Contoléon, R.E.G., loc. cit., p. 170; Dareste, op. cit., p. 254. Cf. B.G.U. I, 96, quoted by Weiss, Gr. Privatrecht, p. 353, n. 350; B.C.H. XXIII, p. 192, No. 59 (αὐτεξούσιος τέκνων δικαίῳ).

(τῆς ζοῆς χρόνον μοι εἶνα προσμένῃ). The same condition of παραμονή is laid down in No. 8 (ἥτις τῆς ζωῆς μου χρόνον προσμενεῖ) and in No. 12 the mistress reserves the χρῆσις of the slave εἰς τὸν τῆς ζωῆς μου χρόνον. The use of the word χρῆσις (usufruct) tends to show that the dedication of the slave was conceived not as a liberation but as a transference to the ownership of the god; παραμονή may be regarded as a condition imposed by arrangement between master and slave, but χρῆσις implies at least in theory an arrangement between the master and the god as new owner. It is very doubtful, however, if χρῆσις in this context proves a real transference to new ownership; in view of the other evidence it seems likely that it involved no more than παραμονή. The practice of attaching conditions to manumission *inter vivos*[7] is typically Greek and the language of our texts can be paralleled from many inscriptions of earlier date. It is possible, of course, that suspensive conditions might have been attached to dedication involving a real transference of a slave to a temple, but the analogy of the formulae used elsewhere is in favor of the hypothesis that our documents are records of real manumission.

This conclusion is supported by another consideration. It is clear from references in the Edessa texts that our inscriptions are merely *stelographiae* set up for purposes of publicity and that the transactions to which they refer were embodied in legal documents of a familiar type.[8] The following are the relevant passages:

1. ἐστηλογράφησα (αὐ)τὸν καὶ τὴν ὠνὴν ἀνέθηκα (?).
2. οὗ δούλου καὶ τὴν καταγραφὴν ἔδωκεν τῇ θε[ῷ].
11. καὶ τὴν ὠνὴν τῆς παιδίσκης ἀπεθέμην τῇ θεῷ, ἔγραψα δὲ τῇ ἐμαυτοῦ χειρί.[9]

Here again it might be argued that the transference of a slave into the ownership of a temple by dedication or sale would demand a legal record, but the publicity given by *stelographia* is

[7] Mitteis, Reichsr. und Volksr., p. 389.

[8] Weiss, op. cit., p. 302; Dareste, op. cit., pp. 261, 283.

[9] Cf. Weiss, p. 303, n. 202. For χειρόγραφον see the documents of Amphissa quoted in B.S.A. XVIII, 1911–1912, p. 143, n. 3.

more natural in case of manumission and again the simplest hypothesis seems to be that the legal documents (*ὠνή* and *καταγραφή*) to which reference is made are of the same general kind as those so often mentioned in earlier manumission records.

To these points may be added that in two of the Edessa texts (6, 11) there is a clause imposing a fine payable to the fisc for any attempt by other parties to seize the 'dedicated' slave. This clause is also frequent in manumission documents and the fact that the fine is payable to the fisc is significant of the intrusion of secular elements.[10] It is true that the clause against *καταδουλισμός* is found elsewhere[11] where the intention is not to manumit but to attach persons to the service of a god, but the status of the persons concerned in our dedications and the absence of any mention of such an intention suggest again that in this feature as in others our inscriptions are to be classified as belonging to the series of Greek emancipation records.

The evidence so far suggests then that our texts are records of a type of manumission which survived in Greek practice even after the edict of Caracalla and that Calderini[12] and others have been right in regarding them as the latest representatives of a series which can be traced back to early times in Greece. These sacral manumissions have commonly been classified in two groups: in one the form is more purely dedicatory, in the other it is explicitly that of sale to the deity. Our Edessa series has usually been regarded as dedicatory, but the difference seems to be more in form than in substance.[13] The *stelographia* is dedicatory in expression, but the terms *ὠνή* and *καταγραφή* suggest that the really effective documents were in the legal form of sale. The process then at Edessa, as at Delphi and elsewhere, was that of sale to the deity. The phrases *ἔδωκεν τῇ θεῷ* and *ἀπεθέμην τῇ θεῷ* may imply not merely the deposit of the document in the temple as a public record office[14] for safe-

[10] Weiss, op. cit., p. 305. Professor Nock points out that the intrusion of civil law does not involve the complete abrogation of religious authority; legal and religious sanctions may exist side by side as at Spoleto (Dessau 4911).

[11] O.G.I. 383, ll. 171 ff.

[12] La Manomissione, pp. 97, 101; Weiss, op. cit., p. 298.

[13] Cf. the mention of payment in earlier dedicatory manumissions, Weiss, op. cit., p. 299, n. 192.

[14] Weiss, op. cit., pp. 303, n. 202, and 358 f.

keeping but the delivery to the god of the title to the slave in the form of a χειρόγραφον. We may conclude also, I think, that in spite of the extension of Roman law after the edict of Caracalla the manumission had the usual effects of the Greek type. It restricted the liberty of the freedman by conditions incompatible with the principles of Roman law and it might even in certain cases be revocable.

If these conclusions are correct, Latte is hardly right in arguing that the effect of the acts recorded in our texts was not to confer even such freedom as was known to Greek law but to bind the slave to the temple as a kind of *colonus*. He himself admits that in Greece in the pre-Christian period there is little evidence for a system of this kind and the examples he quotes (pp. 105 f.) are not relevant. We should on his view be driven to the rather surprising conclusion that our documents, though so similar in form to those of an earlier date, are in fact of an essentially different character.

What light do these manumission records shed on the designation δούλη θεᾶς? It would of course be possible to interpret the words quite literally as 'slave of the goddess' and to assume that Stratto was a temple-slave acquired by purchase or in some other way.[15] That such a slave should have the power to dispose of landed property would be unexpected but not entirely impossible. Another interpretation, however, may be suggested in the light of No. 8 (11), which lays down the condition of παραμονή till the death of the owner: μετὰ δὲ τὴν τελευτήν μου εἶναι αὐτὴν τῆς θεοῦ καὶ ἔγγονα αὐτῆς. The form of the expression is interesting as implying the view that the condition was suspensive, a view which is paralleled in a number of Greek manumissions which date the freedom from the time when the

[15] Cf. the δοῦλος of the θεὰ Συρία in B.C.H. XXI, p. 59, No. 68 and the *servi Venerii* in Cic. Verr. III, 50, etc. It is possible that the terms *liberta Veneris Erycinae* (Cic. Div. in Q. Caec. 55 f.) and *libertus numinis Aesculapi* (C.I.L. III, 1079) refer to such slaves after manumission by the god, but in dealing with the Greek example, ἀπελ(ευθέρῳ) τοῦ με[γίστου θεο]ῦ Σαράπιδος (B.G.U. 7, 1564), Viereck and Zucker take it as designating a person manumitted by the sacral process. The use of ἀπελεύθερος in that sense would presumably be due to the influence of the real status on the terminology; the term δοῦλος τοῦ θεοῦ is more in keeping with the fiction of sale or dedication to the god.

condition of παραμονή shall have been fulfilled.[16] If, as seems probable, No. 8 (11) is to be interpreted in the light of the others of the same group and the group as a whole is rightly taken as related to the earlier forms of Greek manumission, it will follow that εἶναι αὐτὴν τῆς θεοῦ means in effect ἐλευθέραν εἶναι and does not imply any actual servitude to the goddess.[17] The phrase εἶναι αὐτὴν τῆς θεοῦ, however, suggests that the manumitted slave was by a fiction described as the slave of the god, so that the designation δούλη θεᾶς will mean simply that Stratto is a freedwoman who has been manumitted by the process indicated above. This conclusion is confirmed by the inscription of Scydra (Dareste, op. cit., p. 250, No. 14) in which a slave is dedicated as δούλη τῆς θεᾶς with the clear intention of manumission.

There is one point which requires further discussion, since it might be taken to support the view which we have rejected. Both at Edessa and at the Lairbenos shrine the dedications are sometimes made at the command of the god[18] and it might seem that this was compatible only with a theocratic system in which the temple authorities could rely on religion to influence the conduct of men even in matters affecting their economic interests. It is certainly true that the formula indicates a society in which religious influences were particularly strong, but the conflict between religion and interest is not so striking when we consider that the manumission is of the Greek type. We have already seen that the control of the master over his slave was commonly prolonged even after manumission, and it is probable that in the regions concerned the change made little difference

[16] Mitteis, op. cit., p. 387.

[17] Calderini, op. cit., p. 270.

[18] Edessa: 5 (?), 9 (κατὰ χρηματισμόν); Lairbenos: M.A.M.A. IV, 276A (III) (κατὰ θεῖον ὄνειρον), 276B (κατ' ὄνειρον), 277A (II) (κατὰ τὴν ἐπιταγὴν [τοῦ] θεοῦ), Oppermann, loc. cit, Nos. 1 (κατὰ ὄνειρον?), 8, 11. Calderini (p. 105) and Weiss (p. 305) have mistaken the meaning of κατὰ τὴν ἐπιταγήν. At Edessa, according to Oppermann (col. 525), "Freilassung auf Befehl der Gottheit findet sich nicht," but κατὰ χρηματισμόν is best taken in this sense; cf. S.I.G. III, 1173. At the Lairbenos shrine the dream seems to have been the common form of revelation of the divine will and χρηματισμός is to be interpreted in the same way; cf. Matthew, 2, 12: χρηματισθέντες κατ' ὄναρ; Maiistas (Powell, Coll. Alex., p. 69): ἐχρημάτισεν κατὰ τὸν ὕπνον.

to economic relationships. The social relations of master and slave at this period must also be considered; slave children were commonly reared in the household and were often enough the children of their master ἐκ παιδίσκης. While these conditions may explain why men should yield to religious suggestion in such a matter, the real reason why the god was conceived as intervening directly in an action in which he has no apparent interest is perhaps different. In the first place, in the societies which we are considering it is probable that most important actions were regarded as subject to divine guidance by dreams, omens or oracles, and that we know of the god's command particularly in relation to manumission because of its public record by *stelographia*. In the second place, it is clear from a number of indications that at this period at least manumission by conveyance to the god was not simply a legal fiction; it no doubt served a secular purpose, but it was also felt to be a religious act. The god had a special interest in this sphere, so that the dedication of a slave might be made κατ' ἐπιταγήν or κατ' εὐχήν (No. 1).

We have seen then that the Edessa inscriptions do not supply sufficient evidence for the theories which Latte has built upon them. The most natural hypothesis seems to be that they are manumission records of Greek type and that, though their language is in part appropriate to dedication, the real legal documents to which they refer were of a different kind. Here as elsewhere there was a fiction of sale to the deity, partly concealed in the *stelographia* by the use of dedicatory formulae and the omission of mention of payment. But, although liberty was conferred by this process and guaranteed by the state, the conception of the god as owner and protector of the dedicated slave was preserved in the designation δοῦλος τῆς θεᾶς, in the formula εἶναι τῆς θεᾶς for indicating the inception of freedom, and in the use of the word χρῆσις for παραμονή. That this conception was a living one is shown also by the fact that the dedications could be inspired by religious motives.

The problem of our text is now to some extent simplified; we have no longer to look for a theory to explain how Stratto comes to dedicate land to the goddess of whom she is the de-

pendent slave. The analogy of the other texts and the general epigraphic context suggest that the inscription records a conveyance of the land to the goddess and not a conveyance to another person. Public record of a private transaction would not be impossible, but the *stelographia* is more in keeping with the hypothesis that the land is being 'dedicated' to the goddess. We may conjecture, however, that the dedication here, as in the manumission inscriptions, served another purpose. Unfortunately the verb καταγράφειν does not give a clear indication of the exact nature of the transaction recorded. In the manumission inscriptions of Edessa it occurs only once (3) and if it is to be distinguished from δωρεῖν, with which it is combined, it may refer particularly to the method of conveying the slave by καταγραφή. At the Lairbenos shrine it is the verb in regular use in recording emancipations. In other contexts its associations are legal and the use of the noun in connection with manumission has been taken above as an indication that the real form of these manumissions was that of sale to the deity. It might be conjectured therefore that the purpose of the dedication was to convey the property to the goddess by sale. It is unlikely that a mere sale would be thus recorded and it is possible that we have to do with a fiction by which the land was 'dedicated' to the goddess as a security for money lent,[19] the real transaction being a sale ἐν πίστει or πρᾶσις ἐπὶ λύσει.[20] In such a case the use of the land would be retained by Stratto. It is perhaps more likely, however, that the purpose of the dedication was to establish a foundation. The choice of καταγράφειν[21] rather than δωρεῖσθαι or χαρίζεσθαι, which are both in use in the dedicatory formulae of Edessa, may tell to some extent against that view; both occur elsewhere in foundation records and καταγράφειν does not seem to be so used. On the other hand it is possible that owing to its use in the dedicatory form of manumission καταγράφειν, whatever its origin, had come to be used

[19] Cf. Sardis VII, Greek and Latin Inscriptions, No. 2.

[20] Mitteis, Grundzüge, p. 135 ff.; Weiss, op. cit., p. 241.

[21] For καταγράφειν see Mitteis, Grundz., p. 176; Weiss, op. cit., pp. 267 ff. with notes 79 ff., p. 305, n. 210 and p. 405, n. 174; for its use in the *defixiones*, Björck, Der Fluch des Christen Sabinus, p. 121. For δωρεῖσθαι and χαρίζεσθαι in foundation records, see Laum, Stiftungen, I, p. 122.

of dedication in general. There are of course many parallels for the bequest or dedication of land to establish a foundation; at Thessalonica for example ἀνπέλων πλέθρα δύω are bequeathed to a religious body on condition of performing certain rites at the tomb of the deceased.[22] If our inscription was a record of such a foundation, its purpose may have been expressed in the part of the text now lost; analogy suggests that it would be the establishment of some periodic religious service in honor of the goddess or a periodic distribution to a body of her worshippers with the condition of performing certain ceremonies at the tomb of Stratto after her death.

2

S.E.G. VII, 15–26.

In the preceding note an argument as to the nature of the documents of Edessa has been drawn from their resemblance to earlier inscriptions admitted to be records of manumission and from the absence of similar records of the dedication of slaves to the actual service of the gods. This argument would to some extent be weakened if it were proved that the inscriptions from Susa, S.E.G. VII, 15–26, were records of real dedication. It has, however, been conclusively shown by L. Robert in Rev. de Phil. X, 1936, pp. 137 ff. that they are manumission records of Greek type. The most recent writer to deal with the Susa manumissions (Tarn, The Greeks in Bactria and India, pp. 68 f.) accepts Robert's results in the main, but with two reservations. In the first place he regards it as significant that in three complete manumissions the age of the slave woman is given as 'about thirty' and he concludes that if we could explain this fact "we should know the process by which at Susa the Greeks turned dedication into manumission" (p. 69, n. 2). It is possible that the identical ages point to a legal fiction, as Tarn suggests, but it seems unlikely, in view of the history of Greek sacral manumission, that the process by which dedication turned into manumission took place independently at

[22] Baege, op. cit., p. 91; Laum, op. cit., II, p. 41, No. 39. For the gift of vineyards to establish a foundation see also Laum, op. cit., II, Nos. 175A, 175B, 201.

Susa. The second point is of more importance for our purpose; Tarn, who holds the view that our Edessa inscriptions are records of dedication by which the slave became the god's property, sees a parallel instance in S.E.G. VII, 24. It is true that this text differs slightly in formulation from the others, but there seems no reason to suppose that it does not belong to the same class (Robert, p. 144, n. 4). The word *ἀνακηρύξας* (if the reading is right) may perhaps indicate public proclamation as part of the ceremony of manumission, a usage familiar in Greece (Weiss, op. cit., p. 289).

There is one possible argument in favor of real dedication which is not disposed of in Robert's article. The majority of the Susa inscriptions are in form dedications *ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως σωτηρίας* and it might seem at first sight that a merely fictitious dedication would be unsuitable for this purpose. At Edessa also a similar problem is raised by the use of the phrases *εὐξάμενος [?ἐχαρί]σατο* (Pelekides, p. 267) and *κατ' εὐχήν* (No. 1), which are paralleled by the *εὐξάμενος* of S.E.G. VII, 24. This difficulty is not sufficient to upset the conclusion to which the other evidence points; its solution is to be found on the lines indicated above. Though emancipation is the intention and result of the dedication, the process is not regarded as merely a legal fiction. The god is conceived as having an interest in manumission and so the dedication may be made as a *εὐχή* just as it may be made *κατ' ἐπιταγήν*.

Sacral manumission is thus of importance not merely as a survival but as a living religious conception which contributed something to the views of the ancient world on man's relation to God. It would be interesting to inquire whether this conception is to be regarded as having survived continuously with the institution from an early period in Greece, or as having been revived and strengthened by new social and religious influences, after remaining dormant in a period in which sacral manumission was no more than a legal fiction. But such an inquiry lies beyond the scope of this paper.

3

Heberdey-Kalinka, Ber. üb. zwei Reisen im sw. Kleinas. (Denkschr. Wien. Akad. xlv), p. 54, No. 79. Oinoanda.

Κλοινιζόας Ἑρμαίου Ὀνοβ[ά]ρου Μνανδράσεως ἀπέλυσεν τῆι Μητρὶ ὀρείαι ἱεροδούλας Ἀκιεροῦν καὶ Ἀπονιθεῖν τὰς ἑαυτοῦ παῖδις. καὶ ἔστω πάρεξ Ὀπράμιος Ἀρείου τῆι θεᾶι καὶ Κλοινιζιραῖο[ς] καὶ μὴ ἐξέστω μηθενὶ ἀντιποιήσασθαι αὐτοῦ καθ' οὐδένα τρόπον· εἰ δὲ μή, ἔνοχος ἔστω τῆι Μητρὶ ὀρείαι καὶ προσαποτεινέτω ἱερὰς δραχμὰς πεντακοσίας.

The editors of this inscription, followed by Hepding[23] and Latte,[24] interpret it as recording the release by Kloinizoas of his two daughters from hierodulic service to the Meter Oreia. The release is conceived of as effected by the dedication of two substitutes. The terms in which the first of these substitutes is mentioned have occasioned some difficulty. The mention of the father's name suggests that he is free, but the editors (who take Ὀπράμιος as nominative) nevertheless suppose him to be dedicated; Hepding follows them, though he expresses doubts about the reading. Latte, who seems rightly to take Ὀπράμιος as genitive, supposes that Opramis had been dedicated previously. This view would explain why the fine-clause applies only to Kloiniziraios, but not the difficulty of the designation of Opramis by his father's name.

The first step towards the correct explanation of this document is to make a simple alteration in the text. The form παῖδις is inadmissible and the reading παῖδις καί is due either to the mason or the copyist; the original clearly had παιδίσκας (or παιδίσκας καί). This change puts the first part of the inscription in a new light. The women dedicated are slaves and the analogy of the documents discussed above inevitably suggests that this is a case of manumission by dedication to the goddess. That the effect of the act was to manumit and not to transfer to temple-slavery is made certain by the use of ἀπέλυσεν which is not appropriate to real dedication. The word ἱεροδούλας goes

[23] R.-E. VIII, col. 1462, s.v. Hieroduli; Cardinali, Rendic. Accad. dei Linc., XVII, 1908, p. 175, n. 1, does not commit himself.

[24] Op. cit., p. 104, n. 11.

closely with ἀπέλυσεν as its predicate and the whole expression is equivalent to the common earlier formula, ἀνέθηκεν ἱερόν (Calderini, op. cit., p. 438). There is a precise parallel in the formulation of an inscription of Scydra (B.C.H. XLVII, 1923, p. 182): ἀφίημι παιδίσκην ὀνόματι Ἀριάγνην θεᾷ Ἀρτέμιδι Γαζωρίᾳ ἱερόδουλον. The two texts give clear instances of the use of ἱερόδουλος to designate a person manumitted by the sacral process, a use which has sometimes been denied.[25]

The second clause of the inscription records a further manumission with a typical feature which we have already alluded to above. The words παρὲξ Ὀπράμιος Ἀρείου probably express a condition attached to the grant of liberty. The duty of παραμονή may be imposed not only in relation to the master but also in relation to a third party and in this case Opramis, who is, as we should expect from his designation, a free man, is to enjoy the services of the manumitted slave. The words would indeed admit of another explanation, namely that this is a record of a partial manumission such as is known in Egypt,[26] Opramis retaining his part in the common ownership of Kloiniziraios. Too little is known on the subject of partial manumission to say whether the clause imposing the sacral fine for wrongful vindication is compatible with this view, but it suggests rather a completed act of manumission subject to a condition of service to Opramis.

4

M.A.M.A. IV, 279. Ortaköy. Second or third century A.D.

Νεικ . .
ὁμολογῶ
[περὶ] τῶ[ν] περιστερῶν
ἐπιωρκηκέναι με καὶ παραβε[β-]
5. ἦχθαι καὶ πικεχειρηκέναι [ἐπὶ]
τὸ χωρίον καὶ ἠρκέναι πρόβατον
τῶν Δημητρίου, καὶ παρανγ[είλ-]
[α]ντός μοι τοῦ θεοῦ μὴ δίδιν
[τὴ]ν ἐλευθερίαν τῶ κυρίω μου

[25] Cf. R.-E. VIII, col. 1467; Cardinali, op. cit., p. 175.
[26] Mitteis, Grundz., p. 272 f.

10. [πε]ριδιωκόμενος ἔδωκα. ἐκολ-
ἀσθην ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πολλὰ
[κ]αὶ ὀνείροις μοι παρεστάθη καὶ
ἐπενποδὼν (π)ρολαβὼν ἐμὸ[ν]
δοῦλον καὶ ἂν πύλας ἰζόμεν[ον]
15. καὶ κεῖθεν ἀνάξιν. παραν-
γέλλω μηδένα καταφρο-
[νεῖν τῶ θ]εῶ Ἡλίω Ἀπ-
[όλλωνι ἐπεὶ ἔξει] τὴν στήλ-
[ην ἐξεμπλάρι]ον.

This document, perhaps the most remarkable of all those found at the shrine of Lairbenos and in its neighborhood, deserves a fuller treatment than was possible in the first publication. Before proceeding to a discussion of the varied problems which it presents, we may by a simple alteration restore syntax and sense to lines 13 ff. At the beginning of line 13 the stone is worn and the photograph cannot be read with certainty, but it is, in any case, clear that the original copy had εἶπεν ποδῶν. The restoration of εἶπεν not only gives the sentence an intelligible structure but it is in keeping with the usual manner of epiphany descriptions,[27] which commonly record not only the appearance of the god but also his words.

The linguistic and stylistic form of our text has some features of importance. Like others of this region it shows the influence of late and colloquial usage; so, for example, in the use of με and μου,[28] in the middle form παραβεβῆχθαι,[29] the aphaeresis in πικεχειρηκέναι,[30] and the form of the infinitive δίδιν.[31] On the other hand the use of ἐμός,[32] the local use of ἀνά,[33] and the mistaken dative with καταφρονεῖν are learned. The forms ἄν,

[27] Pfister, R.-E., Suppl. IV, col. 277 ff., passim.

[28] Mayser, Gr. d. gr. Pap. II. 1, p. 63 f.; Radermacher, Neut. Gr. (1911), p. 147 (B.G.U. III, 873, 5: ὁμολογῶ ἐσχηκέναι με).

[29] This is hardly an impersonal passive use; it is an example of the incorrect use of the middle, which is sometimes a literary attempt at Atticism (cf. Jannaris, Hist. Gr. Gr., § 1486; Hatzidakis, Einleitung, pp. 194 ff.).

[30] Hatzidakis, op. cit., p. 321; Thumb, Handb., p. 11.

[31] Jannaris, op. cit., § 961; Psaltes, Grammatik, p. 237, § 352.

[32] Cf. n. 57.

[33] Jannaris, op. cit., § 1498.

ἰζόμενον, and κεῖθεν are poetical; the whole phrase in fact looks as if it might have a poetical model. The accusative and infinitive construction is at this date also learned;[34] the current form of indirect command[35] may be seen, for example, in 282, παρα(γ)έλω μηδὶς καταφορνήσει. The same literary touch appears, combined with popular elements, in the style. The second clause of the first sentence, with its genitive absolute and neat rhetorical contrast of μὴ δίδιν and ἔδωκα, has an effective, though unfortunately obscure, structure; the handling of the indirect speech in lines 13–15 is striking for this time and place, and the καὶ κεῖθεν in line 15 has a powerful emphasis. On the other hand the asyndeton[36] (10, 15) and the frequent use of καί[37] (12, instead of participial construction) are in the popular manner. Taken all in all the inscription is not the rude composition of an uncultured sinner;[38] if Neikon (as we may call him) wrote it, his education was better than his character. It seems possible, however, that we should see in the literary touch the hand of a priest; the publicly displayed inscription is a simple kind of edifying literature *ad maiorem dei gloriam*.

In its general structure our text is a typical example of the confession document.[39] It records the name of the sinner, his crime and his punishment, and concludes with a warning to others. The terminology is also of the usual type. Ὁμολογῶ,[40] the regular word for confession, nas legal as well as religious associations; the relation of the god to his people has in fact a quasi-legal aspect. Παραγγέλλω is used elsewhere of the god's

[34] Jannaris, op. cit., p. 573, § 13; Ljungvik, Beitr. z. Syn. d. spätgr. Volksspr., p. 93 (ὁμολογῶ); Hatzidakis, op. cit., p. 215 (Gegenwirkung des Atticismus); the use is particularly striking here, since direct speech is common in epiphany description even in literature.

[35] Ljungvik, op. cit., p. 94.

[36] Ljungvik, op. cit., pp. 87 ff.

[37] Ljungvik, op. cit., pp. 54 ff.

[38] The stylistic features are the most important for this conclusion, along with the evidence of an attempt at literary usage; poetical elements are not always by themselves proof of literary pretensions (v. Mayser, Grammatik (1906), pp. 24 ff.). In our text the combination of pseudo-learned forms, poetical forms and literary style proves clearly that we are dealing with a conscious artistic effort and not merely with popular speech infected by the assimilation of stray poetical elements.

[39] Cf. C.R. XLVII, 1, p. 7.

[40] Mitteis, Grundz., pp. 72 ff.; Pettazoni, La Confess. dei Peccati II, 3, p. 89.

command as well as of the sinner's warning; κολάζειν[41] is the technical term for the divine punishment; in epiphany description παραστῆναι is a standard word.[42] The warning at the end is also conventional in its terminology. The Latinism ἐξεμπλάριον[43] in this region has displaced the Greek παράδειγμα and καταφρονεῖν is common for contempt of the gods. This Greek usage of the word no doubt lies behind the Latin *temnere*[44] in Virgil's line (Aen. VI, 620):

discite iustitiam moniti, et non temnere divos.

It is perhaps worth noting in this connection that καταφρονεῖν is prosaic; where it appears (characteristically) in Euripides it is in the religious usage. In Bacchae 199 it has its usual sense; in 503 it is ironic when used by Pentheus of Dionysus.

The first part of the confession calls for little comment. Perjury is one of the commonest sins and it was probably here combined with sacrilege. The keeping of doves was a branch of ancient (as till recently of modern) husbandry and the case may have been one of simple theft, but reference to the theft of sacred doves elsewhere and their sanctity in the worship of the Dea Syria suggest that Pettazoni[45] is right in assuming that they were dwellers in the sacred precinct and under the special protection of the god. If παραβεβῆχθαι denotes a separate offence, it was probably the breach of some ritual tabu such as is frequently recorded in the confession inscriptions; but it is possible that it goes closely with πικεχειρηκέναι to denote a sacrilegious raid on the temple precinct. Neikon was ἱερόσυλος as well as ἐπίορκος. Whether or not the theft of the sheep was an incident in the raid on the temple is not clear.

The main interest of the document lies in the account of the offence recorded in lines 7–15 with the accompanying description of the appearance of Apollo in a dream (cf. n. 18). As a basis for the discussion of this section it will be convenient to quote the commentary of the editors: "He had promised to free one

[41] Steinleitner, Die Beicht, p. 96, n. 3 (Modern Greek κόλασις = hell).
[42] Pfister, loc. cit., col. 280.
[43] Steinleitner, op. cit., p. 113, n. 1; P. Oxy. 1066, col. III.
[44] Pettazoni, op. cit., p. 195.
[45] Op. cit., pp. 13; 37, n. 87; 61; 68; 95; 97; 137, n. 51.

of the family slaves by a καταγραφή (the method exemplified in, e.g., No. 275B), under which the manumitted slave would become technically the property of the god. But N was still in wardship. His κύριος, disapproving of this alienation, demanded that N should give up to him the document of manumission (ἐλευθερία) in order that he might destroy it. Under pressure N did so, and then suffered the manifest displeasure of the god at being deprived of his promised slave. Thus our text, if correctly interpreted, provides a connection between the two series of inscriptions found on this site, the confessions and the καταγραφαί. . . . The god here desires manumission; in 276A. 18, 276B. 4 and 277A. 12 he commands it." No attempt is made in this account to explain the meaning and point of the difficult passage in lines 13–15, except that by the comparison of ἀνάξιν with ἀνήγαγα in 287.2 the editors indicate that they take it to mean that the slave is to be carried up to the temple. The difficulties raised by our new reading of line 13 and by a more careful consideration of other elements in the problem are very great and before a decision can be reached on the general interpretation it will be necessary to discuss them point by point.

1. The assumption that Neikon is a free man is open to doubt. It is true that the use of a single Greek name is not unexampled (280, 282, 285, 286) in the confession inscriptions and does not necessarily prove an inferior status, but in a text composed with some care we might have expected that the fashion of giving father's name and ethnic would have been followed. It is customary in the manumission documents and occurs also in the confession group (283, 284, 287, 289).

2. It is probably accidental that the phrase τὴν ἐλευθερίαν δίδιν recalls the Latin technical term *libertatem dare*;[46] the use of the article makes it probable that the editors are right in taking ἐλευθερία in the concrete sense of document of manumission. For this they compare ἀπελευθερία[47] at Delphi and the use

[46] The term is mostly, but not always, used of testamentary manumission; Philologus, LXXXVI, 1931, p. 126.

[47] Weiss, op. cit., p. 297, n. 183; cf. ἐλευθέρωσις, P. M. Meyer, Jur. Pap. 6. For ὠνή, Weiss, op. cit., p. 303, n. 202.

of the equally abstract ὠνή. The development of this sense was no doubt via the use of ἐλευθερία for manumission,[48] a use which is known in late Greek. The reference is of some interest since the analogy of other inscriptions here, as the editors point out, suggests that the manumission would be of the type recorded in the form καταγράφω κτλ.[49] We thus have evidence of similarity of method here and at Edessa in that *stelographia* is used for publicity while the manumission is legally effected by means of a written document. It is not clear whether the document is to be deposited in the temple[50] or given to the freedman; in the view of the editors it would appear that the transaction is incomplete and that the document is still in the hands of the owner. Nor can we be quite sure of the form of the manumission. It is natural to suppose that it would be of the same kind as those recorded in the *stelographia* at the shrine, but it cannot be quite certain that the ἐλευθερία was not of one of the types known in the papyri.[51] In any case it seems certain from the context that a written document and not any formal act was the essential feature.

3. The use of the word κύριος is one of the most difficult problems of our text. The editors assume that Neikon is in wardship without making it clear whether they refer to Greek or Roman usage. The date of the inscription is unfortunately uncertain, but it seems likely from the designation of Neikon that we are dealing with peregrine custom and that κύριος therefore is not being used in the sense of *tutor*, which it has in P. M. Meyer, Jur. Pap. 27. In Greek usage κύριος is of course common for the *tutor* of a woman, but it is an unusual word for the guardian of a minor, ἐπίτροπος being the technical term. There is a little evidence for the use of κύριος in this sense,[52] but in the papyri, where we might expect to find it, it appears to be absent. Apart from this difficulty of terminology, it must be admitted that a minor who perjures himself, raids the holy pre-

[48] B.G.U., 326, ii, 11; cf. Suicerus, Thes. Eccl., s.v.

[49] For καταγράφειν here, cf. Weiss, op. cit., p. 305 and n. 210.

[50] See above, n. 14.

[51] Mitteis, Grundz., p. 271 ff.; see below, n. 88 and n. 90.

[52] Lipsius, Att. R., p. 520, n. 2; cf. [Dem.] πρὸς Μακ. § 15: κύριον ἐπιγραψάμενος τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ.

cinct, steals sheep and proposes to manumit a slave without the coöperation of his guardian is a curious phenomenon. The relation implied in the word *περιδιωκόμενος* also involves a rather odd situation. Without prejudice to future conclusions we may say that the language is almost more applicable to the relation of master and slave, and *κύριος* in fact, apart from other considerations, would normally mean master rather than guardian.

4. The epiphany description presents a difficult problem (ignored by the editors), the solution of which, if it could be attained, would have an important bearing on the general interpretation. We have already seen that *παραστῆναι* is a standard word for epiphany and it is possible that the linguistic peculiarities noticed above have been introduced as in keeping with the tone of divine utterance. This may be true also of the emphatic *καὶ κεῖθεν* which expresses the *δύναμις* of the god in a form somewhat similar to that which occurs in the Septuagint version of Amos 9, 2: *ἐὰν κατορυγῶσιν εἰς ἅδου, ἐκεῖθεν ἡ χείρ μου ἀνασπάσει αὐτούς· καὶ ἐὰν ἀναβῶσιν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, ἐκεῖθεν κατάξω αὐτούς· ἐὰν ἐγκρυβῶσιν εἰς τὴν κορυφὴν τοῦ Καρμήλου, ἐκεῖθεν ἐξερευνήσω καὶ λήμψομαι αὐτούς.* A parallel passage is Obad. 1, 4: *ἐὰν μετεωρίσθῃς ὡς ἀετὸς καὶ ἐὰν ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἄστρων θῇς νοσσιάν σου, ἐκεῖθεν κατάξω σε, λέγει κύριος.* An attempt has clearly been made in our text to attain to something of the same effect. There is, however, a secular parallel[53] to this turn of thought and expression which may give a clue to the meaning of the passage. In Just. Nov. 17, 7 restrictions are imposed on the use of sanctuary: *οὔτε δὲ ἀνδροφόνοις οὔτε μοιχοῖς οὔτε παρθένων ἅρπαξιν ἁμαρτάνουσι τὴν ἐκ τῶν ὅρων φυλάξεις ἀσφάλειαν, ἀλλὰ κἀκεῖθεν ἐξελκύσεις καὶ τιμωρίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπάξεις.* It is clear then that the god's utterance may be a threat of violent abduction from a place of refuge or sanctuary; the exact sense of the words is, however, more difficult to establish and a detailed examination of the language is necessary.

(*a*) *ποδῶν προλαβὼν ἐμὸν δοῦλον.* This construction is familiar in Greek,[54] but it is probable that its use here has been influenced

[53] Quoted by Wenger, *Ὅροι Ἀσυλίας*, Philologus LXXXVI, 1931, p. 441.

[54] Kühner, Gr. Gr. II, i, p. 348, Anm. 5; Poultney, The Syntax of the Gen. Case in Aristoph. (1936), p. 86.

by a literary model. To drag by the feet is an action performed on a person incapable of resistance such as a slain enemy, as for example in Homer, Iliad IV, 463:

> τὸν δὲ πεσόντα ποδῶν ἕλαβε κρείων Ἐλεφήνωρ
> Χαλκωδοντιάδης, μεγαθύμων ἀρχὸς Ἀβάντων,
> ἕλκε δ' ὑπὲκ βελέων λελιημένος ὄφρα τάχιστα
> τεύχεα συλήσειε.

And again in Iliad XVIII, 155:

> τρὶς μέν μιν μετόπισθε ποδῶν λάβε φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ
> ἑλκέμεναι μεμαώς, μέγα δὲ Τρώεσσιν ὁμόκλα.

It will be noticed that in each case it is combined with ἕλκειν, a word which is also typical of the violent procedure of *manus iniectio*[55] as in Aesch., Suppl. 909, where a similar grammatical construction is used:

> ἕλξειν ἔοιχ' ὑμᾶς ἐπισπάσας κόμης.

This usage may be compared with that in the Rudens (660), where the tables are turned on the *leno* who intends to lay violent hands on the suppliants:

> proripite hominem pedibus huc itidem quasi occisam suem.

Our phrase then is clearly in keeping with a threat of ἀπαγωγή; the god threatens to seize the slave and drag him off like a corpse.

(*b*) Ἐμός is a crucial word. Leaving aside the question whether the text is sound,[56] it seems to admit two explanations. The first and simplest is that ἐμός refers to Neikon and that the god threatens simply to seize his slave. It is not impossible, however, that ἐμός is an example of the intrusion of direct speech into the indirect form.[57] This interpretation would be in keep-

[55] Schulze, Kl. Schr., pp. 160 ff., especially p. 162, n. 4.

[56] The stone is worn at the end of the line, but the photograph seems to confirm ἐμό[ν] and exclude ἐμέ; a further examination of stone or impression would be necessary to put this beyond all doubt. Ἐμέ, in any case, seems stylistically less probable.

[57] The confusion might have been assisted by the facts that ἐμός was a dying form (Mayser, op. cit. 1, p. 304) and that for popular speech ἑαυτοῦ might also have been ambiguous (ibid., pp. 303 f.).

ing with the conventional phraseology which we have already traced in the passage. When Kreon lays hands on Antigone (Soph., O.C. 834) he says *τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἄγω*, words which recall those of the herald in Euripides, Heracleidae 267:

ἄξω γε μέντοι τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἐγὼ λαβών.

In these phrases we no doubt have an echo of the formal language in which ownership of the person seized was claimed.[58] That this usage persisted later is confirmed by Epictetus III, 24, 75: *ἰδοὺ ἐπείληπταί σου τίς ποτε οὗτος ὁ ἐξάγων σε ἀπὸ τῆς συνήθους σοι διατριβῆς καὶ λέγει 'δοῦλος ἐμὸς εἶ.'* On this view *ἐμός* would be appropriate in the mouth of the god, if he was claiming the slave as his own, and its effect would have been lost if translated into the indirect form.

(*c*) *Ἀνάξιν.* The simple verb *ἄγειν* is the *verbum proprium* for the seizure of a person claimed as a slave. We have seen it in the examples above and Plato uses it in the section of the Laws (XI, 914e) which deals with this subject: *ἀγέτω τὸν ἑαυτοῦ δοῦλον ὁ βουλόμενος.* It is commonly combined with *λαμβάνεσθαι* (or *ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι*) as in the Gorgias 527a: *ἐπειδὰν σου λαβόμενος ἄγῃ.* The compound *ἀπάγειν* is also common, but *ἀνάγειν* has special meanings of its own. The editors, as we have seen, are inclined to think that this compound is to be taken simply of the action of hauling up to the temple, but three other usages fall to be considered. In the first place *ἀνάγειν* is technical in the phrase *ἀνάγειν εἰς πρατῆρα* for the return of an object sold against which a claim is made by a third party. In the second place it is used of the summary arrest and bringing up before the authorities of a fugitive or an evil-doer.[59] In Sophocles, Ichn. 175, for example, *ἐμὸς εἶ, ἀνάγου* is appropriately used when the satyrs are on the track of a thief. In O.G.I. 483, 185 it is coupled with *ἐπίληψις*, an equally technical word: *ἔστω δὲ τῶν ἄλλων τῷ βουλομένῳ ἐπίληψις τῶν κακουργούντων περὶ τὰς κρήνας, καὶ ὁ ἀναγαγὼν ἢ ἀνενέγκας ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀστυνόμους τὸν ληφθέντα μεριζέσθω κτλ.* The formula for the seizure of a fugitive thief or a criminal

[58] For another such formula, see Diod. Sic. XV, 52, 3: *καθάπερ ἦν εἰθισμένον, ἀνηγόρευε κηρύττων μήτ' ἐξάγειν Θήβηθεν μήτ' ἀφανίζειν, ἀλλ' ἀπάγοντα πάλιν ἀνασώζειν.*

[59] This use is well illustrated by Holden on Plut. Them., pp. 143, 209.

caught redhanded is equally applicable to the runaway slave; so for example in the advertisement for fugitive slaves in Wilcken, Urk. der Ptolemäerz., 121, l. 12 (cf. l. 24): *τοῦτον ὃς ἂν ἀναγάγῃ, λήψεται χαλκοῦ (τάλαντα) β(γ), ἐφ' ἱεροῦ δείξας (ταλ.) α(β) κτλ.* These examples are sufficient to show that *ἀνάγειν* in our text might have a more technical sense than the editors supposed. The slave is perhaps to be treated as a *δραπέτης* who is *ἀγώγιμος* without formality; as Plato says in the passage quoted above (Laws XI, 914e), the master may seize his slave *ἐὰν ἔμφρων ᾖ, χρησόμενος ὅτι ἂν ἐθέλῃ τῶν ὁποσα ὅσια.*

The third use of *ἀνάγειν* which deserves mention is that in which it expresses the idea of bringing up from the dead, a use which is common at all periods. Two examples may be quoted:

1. Arist., Frogs 77:

> *εἶτ' οὐχὶ Σοφοκλέα πρότερον Εὐριπίδου*
> *μέλλεις ἀναγαγεῖν, εἴπερ ἐκεῖθεν δεῖ σ' ἄγειν;*

2. Wisdom of Solomon (LXX) 16, 13:

> *σὺ γὰρ ζωῆς καὶ θανάτου ἐξουσίαν ἔχεις*
> *καὶ κατάγεις εἰς πύλας ᾅδου καὶ ἀνάγεις.*

This second passage is of importance as an example of a formula commonly used to express the omnipotence of God; the formula and the religious conception which it embodies have been fully discussed by Kroll (Gott und Hölle, pp. 384 ff.) and we shall draw later on some of his examples in considering one possible interpretation of our inscription.

(*d*) *Ἂν πύλας ἰζόμενον.* This phrase is perhaps the most puzzling part of the inscription; we have already noted the peculiarities of its linguistic form and must now attempt to divine its meaning. A clue is given by the word *ἰζόμενον*; sitting is the attitude of the lazy man, the sorrowful man, the penitent[60] and (more relevant to our purpose) the suppliant.[61] This last usage is as old as Homer[62] and is very common in classical

[60] E.g. Menander, Kock III, p. 164; Plut. de Superst., 168d; Tibullus, 1, 3, 30 (below). Cf. Martial, IV, 30, 13.

[61] Latte, op. cit., pp. 106 f.; Stengel, Die gr. Kultusalt., p. 80.

[62] Od. 7, 160.

literature, not only in tragedy but also in history.[63] The non-literary use appears for example in the phrase ὅσοι κα ἦνται,[64] which in the well-known inscription of Andania denotes the slaves who seek asylum in the shrine. This example inevitably suggests that our slave is thought of as seeking asylum in a place of refuge. The admission of slaves to this right in certain shrines is well authenticated over a long period in the ancient world.[65] The practice is recognized in the law of Gortyn[66] and in Ptolemaic Egypt,[67] Euripides[68] refers to the βωμοὶ θεῶν as the refuge of the slave, Herodotus[69] uses the motive in the story of Paris and Helen in Egypt, and Aristophanes[70] alluded to the slave's right of seeking sanctuary in the Theseum from a harsh master. Similar asyla were recognized at Phlius[71] and at Palike[72] in Sicily and the Greek custom persisted in Asia[73] in the Roman period. Cicero[74] alludes to an occasion on which a Roman praetor was prevented by force from removing a slave from the shrine of Diana at Ephesus, and Tacitus[75] in describing the widespread abuse of asylum in Asia includes slaves among those who took refuge: *complebantur templa pessimis servitiorum.* Even at a later date the Greek custom persisted and Antoninus Pius[76] gave it official recognition: *Consultus a quibusdam praesidibus provinciarum de his servis, qui ad aedem sacram vel ad statuas principum confugiunt, praecepit ut, si intolerabilis videatur dominorum saevitia, cogantur servos bonis condicionibus vendere, ut pretium dominis daretur.* If our inscription alludes to this practice, we should, then, expect the place of refuge to be either a temple or a statue of the emperor. We have instead the obscure phrase ἂν πύλας which now falls to be discussed.

[63] E.g. Thuc. I, 24; 126, 10, 11; 136, 3; 137, 1; III, 28, 2; 70, 5; 75, 3, 5.
[64] S.I.G. 736, 83.
[65] Weiss, op. cit., p. 532 ff.
[66] E.g. Schwyzer, Dial. gr. ex. 179, 1, 39 (ναεύειν).
[67] Urk. der Ptolemäerz., 121, l. 12 (above).
[68] Suppl. 268.
[69] II, 13 (μέχρι ἐμεῦ).
[70] Knights 1311 ff. Frg. 567 (Pollux 7, 13); cf. frg. 458; Eupolis apud Poll. 7, 13; Plut. Theseus XXXVI.
[71] Paus. II, xiii, 3.
[72] Diodorus XI, 89, 6.
[73] Chapot, La Prov. rom. d'Asie, pp. 406 ff.
[74] Verr. 1, 33, 85.
[75] Ann. III, 60.
[76] Just. Inst. 1, 8, 2.

The hearth[77] of the private house and the altars of the gods are the places where refuge is commonly sought by the suppliant and there are few direct references to the taking of sanctuary at the doors[78] of men or gods. This practice, however, would fit naturally into a pattern of related usages partly secular partly sacral. The door is the barrier that shuts off the great and powerful in any sphere from those who wish to seek their aid; the weak must sit at the door and await admission. Thus in Homer[79] the stranger stands at the door awaiting the invitation to enter, lovers sigh at the doors of their mistresses, beggars and philosophers[80] haunt the doors of the wealthy, pupils must go to the doors of their teachers[81] and the layman must seek *responsa* at the doors of the learned in law.[82] Similarly petitioners must go to the king's gate[83] and those who seek an oracle to the gate of the temple. The penitent[84] too, pagan or Christian, must grovel before the sacred door of temple or church. To all these practices there is common the idea of appeal and supplication and, as Norden has pointed out, the sacred and secular usages were not entirely unrelated. When Virgil says (Aen. VI, 151):

> dum consulta petis nostroque in limine pendes,

he happily combines legal with religious language. He has already in the same passage (l. 109) presented the picture of the suppliant at the gate:[85]

> quin ut te supplex peterem, et tua limina adirem
> idem orans mandata dabat.

[77] E.g. Od. 7, 160; Ap. Rhod. IV, 693; Plut. Them. XXIV; Herod. 1, 35.

[78] There is a curious passage relating to the sanctity of gates and doors in Porphyrius, De Antro Nymph. § 27, where it is said: *οἶδε δὲ καὶ Ὅμηρος ἱερὰς τὰς θύρας, ὡς δηλοῖ παρ' αὐτῷ ὁ σείων Οἰνεὺς ἀνθ' ἱκετηρίας 'σείων κολλητὰς σανίδας, γουνούμενος υἱόν'* (Il. IX, 581 ff.). This is no doubt a misinterpretation of Homer, but it may imply familiarity with the idea of supplication at the gate.

[79] Od. I, 119.

[80] E.g. Plato, Symp. 203b; Rep. 364b; Luke 16, 21; Arist. Rhet. 1391 all.

[81] Plato, Phaedr. 245a.

[82] Aristoph. Clouds 469.

[83] Herod. III, 40; Esther (LXX), 4, 1.

[84] Cf. Tibullus, 1, 2, 85 (below); Bingham, The Ant. of the Chr. Ch. (ed. 1856), p. 1059.

[85] "Das *limen* des Tempels ist nach alten Glauben beider Völker ein sakraler Begriff" (Norden ad loc.). So also the gates of cities are *sanctae res* and *quodam modo divini iuris* (Gaius, Inst. 2, 8).

The language of our text makes it probable that it may be interpreted in the light of the usage just described. Though I have found no exact parallel, there are a number of passages which bear some resemblance to ours. In Aeschylus, Ch. 567, for example, Orestes and Pylades station themselves as suppliants at the palace gate:

> μενοῦμεν οὕτως ὥστ' ἐπεικάζειν τινὰ
> δόμους παραστείχοντα καὶ τάδ' ἐννέπειν
> "τί δὴ πύλῃσι τὸν ἱκέτην ἀπείργεται
> Αἴγισθος, εἴπερ οἶδεν ἔνδημος παρών;"

Similar references to the gates or doors occur elsewhere with reference to temples; so, for example, in Euripides (Suppl. 104):

> τίς δ' ὁ στενάζων οἰκτρὸν ἐν πύλαις ὅδε;

Again in Herodotus (VI, 91) the Aeginetan seeking sanctuary φεύγει πρὸς πρόθυρα Δήμητρος θεσμοφόρου, ἐπιλαβόμενος δὲ τῶν ἐπισπαστήρων εἴχετο. This passage has a certain similarity to the obscure lines at the end of the Ion (1611) which may possibly also bear on our topic:

> νῦν δὲ καὶ ῥόπτρων χέρας
> ἡδέως ἐκκριμνάμεσθα καὶ προσεννέπω πύλας.

The sanctity attaching to the door and threshold of the temple of Delphi is reflected also at a later date in the fact that here on occasion formal payment was made for emancipation: ἐν τῷ νεῷ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀδοῦ κατὰ τὸ μέγα θύρωμα (G.D.I. 1953).

To these Greek references may be added two from Tibullus, though they are concerned with prayer and penitence rather than sanctuary against violence:

1. (1, 2, 85):

> non ego si merui, dubitem procumbere templis
> et dare sacratis oscula liminibus.
> non ego tellurem genibus perrepere supplex
> et miserum sancto tundere poste caput.

2. (1, 3, 30):

> ut mea votivas persolvens Delia voces
> ante sacras lino tecta fores sedeat.

The sources hitherto quoted are literary and, as we have seen from its form, our passage may well have had a literary model. There are, however, one or two non-literary passages which may have some relevance. Two of these may be quoted.

1. B.G.U. VIII, 1762:

κατήντησαν ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ
ν[- - -] . . γει . [- -] . πύλην
καὶ ἐπεβοῶντο τ̣ὰ̣ς
βασιλίσσας καὶ δυνάμεις.

The lost word in line 2 was the name of a public building or temple; the appeal for help is made at the gate of authority.

2. Cod. Th. 9, 45, 4:

usque ad extremas fores ecclesiae . . . confugientibus aram salutis esse praecipimus.

It is just possible that the language here indicates the gate as a place of special importance to the seeker of sanctuary, but the point cannot be pressed. Neither the Greek nor the Latin text makes it quite clear whether the *fores* referred to are the outer door of the church leading to a vestibule distinct from the *oratorium* (εὐκτήριον) itself or, as Wenger has argued in the article already cited (pp. 443 ff.), the gate of the precinct of the church marked off by ὅροι as sanctuary. On this analogy the πύλαι of our text might be regarded as the gate of the temple precinct. It would perhaps be dangerous to argue from the analogy of later Christian usage, but it may be noted further that Wenger has made a plausible case for supposing that the τελευταῖαι θύραι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, the goal of the seeker of sanctuary, were marked by statues of the emperors which would themselves give protection. It is possible that this may have been true also of pagan temples at an earlier date, and so that in our inscription the fugitive may be pictured as seeking refuge not in the sanctity of the temple but in that of an imperial statue.

It will be clear from this excursus that the phrase ἂν πύλας ἱζόμενον can be naturally interpreted to mean that the slave is pictured as a suppliant at a gate or door, but unfortunately the nature of the authority to which he is appealing is uncertain.

We have already seen that the preceding line suggests the terminology of ἀπαγωγή and as a natural corollary it might be assumed that ἂν πύλας ἰζόμενον referred to the practice already noted of giving sanctuary to fugitive slaves in the temples of Asia. It would also, however, be a reasonable supposition that the temple of refuge in this area would be that of Apollo Lairbenos, so that we should have the strange result that the god threatens to violate his own sanctuary. That the sanctuary might be given by an imperial statue at the gate of a temple is no more than a conjecture. It must be noted, however, that the same or similar terminology is used to indicate rather different usages. Appeal is made to the rich or powerful at their doors and we have seen that in Egypt it is made to official authority at the gate of a public building. Even the appeal at the gate of a temple may be of two kinds: it may be that of the person who is seeking sanctuary against violent seizure or that of the penitent who confesses his sin and craves the forgiveness of the deity. This last usage is one to be carefully considered in interpreting our document as a whole, since it belongs to a group of confession inscriptions, which are no doubt merely a public record set up after the real act of confession and penitence itself.

Finally, to conclude[86] this discussion of the phrase ἂν πύλας, it is necessary to note, in view of the use of ἀνάγειν remarked on above, that the gates of hell are the most familiar of all. Usage, however, is against the use of πύλαι by itself in this sense, without its usual accompaniment ἅδου.[87] Nevertheless this possibility cannot be rejected out of hand, especially as there may be an allusion to some literary source.

It will be seen that our examination of the language has suggested two main lines of interpretation of the god's speech, depending on our view of ἂν πύλας ἰζόμενον; on one view the reference is to ἀπαγωγή from sanctuary, on the other to a search-

[86] The common use of πύλαι in LXX to denote the gate as the place where justice is administered does not seem relevant to our passage.

[87] Or without a significant adjective, as perhaps in the phrase σιδηρᾶς θύρας ῥήξω, to which Professor Nock draws my attention (Proc. Brit. Acad. XVII, 1931, p. 251, l. 12 with the note on p. 263); cf. Kroll, op. cit., passim.

ing out by the god even from the gates of hell. That the violent language of the god should be appropriate to either view is not unnatural, as we shall see below.

We have now reviewed the separate elements of the problem and are in a better position to attempt an interpretation of the whole. Owing to the uncertainty of the meaning in detail it is difficult to form a hypothesis which will account consistently for all the phenomena and we must be content to suggest various possibilities, pointing out the strength and weakness of each.

1. The interpretation of the editors, as we saw above, involves a difficulty in the use of κύριος and a general improbability in the assumed relation of ward and guardian. It does, however, present a reasonable picture of the manumission problem. Manumission has been promised, perhaps, as Pettazoni suggests (pp. 57, 61), at the command of the god; the document has been drawn up and has been cancelled; the god who has rights in this sphere and is injured by losing a slave, who would by a fiction be his, punishes Neikon and threatens to claim his own by the process of ἀπαγωγή. Here we meet with the difficulty of ἂν πύλας ἰζόμενον. In a religious centre of this kind the temple of refuge could hardly be other than that of Lairbenos. Does the god then threaten to drag away the slave from the sanctuary of his own gates? We cannot escape this difficulty by assuming that ἂν πύλας refers to an imperial statue or some other place of refuge, for it is still difficult to see why the slave should be pictured as taking sanctuary to escape violent action on the part of Apollo. The slave's interest lies in manumission and he would not naturally be a δραπέτης but merely an object in dispute between the god and his master.

If this interpretation is to be saved, we may seek for a solution of the problem in the not unnatural confusion of reality and dream. If we assume that the manumission intended was of a kind which would have made the slave δοῦλος τοῦ θεοῦ, then the god would be conceived as his δεσπότης and would naturally appear in that rôle in the dream to claim him, if necessary by force. Why is the slave pictured as taking sanctuary and resisting the claim? Perhaps because that would be the natural rôle

of a slave whose master came to fetch him. On this view the dream corresponds only imperfectly with reality. The appearance of the god as master is based naturally on the fiction of divine ownership, but to picture the slave as taking refuge from him is inconsistent with the real situation. The inconsistency is a serious difficulty, if we hold that the dream is the work of a writer who aimed at an exact correspondence of symbolism and fact. If it was, as is very possible, a genuine dream, we may simply accept the inconsistency and suppose that the god did in fact appear as the angry owner threatening to recover his slave even from sanctuary. His violent tone is due to his displeasure with Neikon, who has coöperated, even if unwillingly, in robbing him of what was rightly his.

2. A second interpretation which saves the essential features of the first suggests itself in the light of the usage of *ἀνάγειν* of bringing up from the dead, if we may take that in conjunction with a possible use of *πύλαι* alone to mean the gates of Hades. In the work already mentioned (p. 348, n. 3) Kroll has collected a number of passages from Greek and Latin literature in which occur as almost proverbial expressions such phrases as *ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ Θανάτου πύλης*, *a Mortis limine* or *ab Orci faucibus*; to this list may be added others quoted by Jacobs on Achilles Tatius 5, 9. These phrases have a strong resemblance to the formulae of certain passages of the Old Testament (ibid., pp. 334 ff.) in which the power of God to rescue even from the gates of death is extolled by his worshippers. It would be dangerous, as Kroll remarks, to assume in general a derivation of classical from oriental usage, but in one passage (Achilles Tatius 6, 13) the resemblance is particularly striking in that the rescue is attributed to the gods. Sosthenes speaks of himself as a man, *ὃν οὕτω φιλοῦσιν οἱ θεοὶ ὡς αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκ μέσων τῶν τοῦ Θανάτου πυλῶν ἀναγαγεῖν*. The resemblance of this passage to ours is apparent and suggests the possibility that the words of the god may be explained as reflecting not the formula of *ἀπαγωγή* from asylum but that which expresses the omnipotence of God even over the gates of hell. In that case we should assume that the god appears and announces his intention of recovering his slave no matter where he may be.

It might reasonably be objected to this view that the words of the god are threatening and that the violent language (*ποδῶν προλαβών*) is inappropriate in regard to an action which is really benevolent. It may be answered, however, that the explanation lies in the fact that violence is an essential element in the conception which we are considering; the gates of bronze and the bars of iron must be broken. The same feature appears in the terminology of the Latin formulae; thus in Livy (9, 6, 3) *ab inferis extracti*, in Apuleius (Met. 9, 24) *mediis Orci manibus extractus*, and elsewhere *rapuisti e faucibus Orci* (Anth. Lat., I, 2, 789, 5 Riese). It is in fact not an accident that the language resembles that of *ἀπαγωγή*; the process of *manus iniectio* has its counterpart in *vindicatio* and both parties may use violence over the person in dispute. It is natural therefore that we should find a mingling of the religious and legal ideas, as in the phrases *ab Orci faucibus vindicari* (Arnobius 2, 53) and *ῥυομένου ἀνθρώπους ἐκ θανάτου* (Themist. Or. XIII, p. 169B). It is unnecessary to inquire here whether such terminology reflects a synthesis of oriental and classical ideas; it is enough for our purpose to show that the tone of violence in the words of Apollo is not out of keeping with the hypothesis under discussion. The essential feature of the conception is not benevolence but the strength and power of the god, which reach to earth and heaven and may be used to seize the fugitive as well as to rescue the suppliant. The latter aspect is reflected in the passages just referred to, the former in those which we cited above. It is unnecessary therefore to take the speech of the god as benevolent and as expressing the intention of saving the slave by hauling him forth like a drowning man even from the last extremity; it seems more natural to suppose that the slave is pictured as a mere *corpus vile* on whom the god's power will be exercised wherever he may be. The language is thus appropriate to the context; the epiphany of Apollo is a warning to Neikon of his power and strength and motivates the confession.

The use of the word *ἰζόμενον* may be felt as an obstacle to this view; in Greek usage it naturally suggests that the slave is seeking sanctuary and therefore that he is pictured not as a mere passive object of dispute but as actively seeking to escape

from a master. I can see no answer to this difficulty unless we suppose that ἰζόμενον is used here, as κάθημαι often is elsewhere, of sitting in sorrow. It happens that the Septuagint supplies an example of this use in a passage of the kind we have been discussing. Sinners sitting in darkness and the shadow of death (καθημένους ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου) are rescued by the power of Jehovah (Kroll, p. 335).

If the words of the god are to be taken thus, not as having reference to the idea of asylum but as expressing a power which extends even to the gates of hell, the passage may be added as a parallel, though the sense is different, to the formula already quoted from Achilles Tatius, which Kroll suggests may show some oriental influence. The character of our inscription as an epiphany description would make our example a much more striking one, and there can be little doubt, if this interpretation is right, that the language has been influenced by religious sources of an oriental type, perhaps by the Septuagint itself. There would be nothing surprising in this in view of other evidence for Jewish influence in Asia Minor and oriental features in the religious practice of this particular area. Unfortunately the phrase ἂν πύλας ἰζόμενον is too obscure to permit us to draw with certainty a conclusion which would be of great interest for the religious history of the period.

3. A third hypothesis is possible when we notice that there is nothing in the language of the inscription that proves that the document was to be handed over for cancellation. The use of ἔδωκα would more naturally suggest the delivery of a document to a person who was to make use of it[88] and it may have been demanded by the κύριος in order that effect might be given to it. It is even possible, though perhaps improbable, that τῷ κυρίῳ is merely dative of the agent with περιδιωκόμενος and that the indirect object of δίδιν and ἔδωκα is unexpressed. Can this hypothesis be reconciled with the intervention of the god? It may be, if two considerations are borne in mind. Firstly that the god is directly concerned in punishing disobedience

[88] Cf. Weiss, op. cit., pp. 442 ff. and notes. Weiss (ibid., n. 46) quotes a case somewhat similar to ours: ἐπανανκάσαι με μετὰ ὑβρέων καὶ πληγῶν ἐγδόσθαι γράμματα χειρογράφου πράσεως κτλ.

whatever the nature of the act, secondly that the confession inscription may be a cunning method of gaining the support of religion in a private dispute. By publishing his own disobedience and punishment Neikon involves the κύριος who has compelled him to sin and at the same time furthers his own interest, which is to retain the slave, by making the god appear to recover him by violence. The slave is quite naturally pictured as a suppliant who is seeking sanctuary to escape *vindicatio in servitutem*. On this view ἐμὸς δοῦλος, is loosely used for the slave who has been freed but whose liberty is contested because his master has manumitted him *vi coactus*.[89] The god's action is not to claim him as his own but to restore him as a δραπέτης to Neikon, even if he has to drag him back from sanctuary or from Hades. That the language can bear this interpretation is shown by the use of ἀνάγειν in Urk. der Ptolemäerz. 121, l. 12 and by Plato's phrase in the Laws, XI, 914e: ἀγέτω δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ ἄλλων τῶν οἰκείων ἢ φίλων τὸν ἀφεστῶτα ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ.

The chief difficulty of this view is the character of the dream. It is true that Neikon is being punished for disobedience and that the god may be regarded as announcing his intention to restore the slave simply because he had forbidden his manumission. So much Neikon might have invented for his own ends, but there is a certain oddness in the device. The recovery of the slave is in Neikon's interest, but the appearance of the god is naturally taken as threatening, associated as it is with the κόλασις. It needed a good deal of impudence even for Neikon thus to distort the situation and to present the forcible return of the slave as part of the god's punishment for disobedience. This difficulty could be mitigated only by supposing that the god had some interest in forbidding manumission; his threatening appearance would then be natural enough. Our evidence does not enable us to say what such an interest could have been; it is possible that if Neikon stood in some special relation to the temple the manumission of a slave might have been detrimental to it, but on this matter we can only speculate.

4. We have seen above that the designation of Neikon and

[89] Cf. Buckland, Roman Law of Slavery, p. 593 (*vis* and *metus*).

the use of κύριος would be compatible with the view that Neikon was a slave. Taking ἐμὸς δοῦλος then, in the manner previously suggested, as the intrusion of a direct form into the indirect speech, we should obtain another picture of the situation. Neikon would be a slave who had been manumitted by a sacral process which made him δοῦλος τοῦ θεοῦ and had been forced to hand back the document[90] which was essential to the act. Subsequently, to score off his κύριος, he invokes religion and presents the god as coming to claim his rights. It is true that these rights may have been fictitious, but, as we have seen, he was felt to have special powers in the sphere of manumission and in a dream would naturally enough play the rôle which belonged to him in theory. He thus appears not only to punish Neikon for disobedience but to seize him, in spite of excuses,[91] as a slave who has transferred himself to another master. This hypothesis has one strong advantage in presenting the threatening language of the god in a natural light; the violent tone is much more in keeping if we regard the words as addressed to the person who is himself the object of the divine displeasure. On this view, however, ἂν πύλας ἰζόμενον again creates a difficulty, unless it refers to some unknown place of refuge to which Neikon might be conceived as flying from the wrath of Apollo, or unless we can interpret the words in relation to the practice of penitence. The threat of the god would then be to seize him even if he comes to the temple to confess and seek pardon for his disobedience. This difficulty would of course disappear altogether if we could take the πύλαι as the gates of Hades. The threat would then be to seek him out and fetch him back, no matter where he might take refuge.

On this hypothesis also there is a certain inconsistency in presenting what is really to the advantage of Neikon as a threat of violence to him, but the picture has more internal consistency. By his disobedience Neikon has removed himself from

[90] The revocability of manumission presents no difficulty in Greek usage; cf. Wyse on Isaeus, p. 379; Latte, op. cit., p. 101. That the manumission should be revoked by the recall and destruction of a document seems also in keeping with Greek custom; cf. Weiss, op. cit., p. 443.

[91] For excuses in the confession inscriptions, cf. M.A.M.A. IV, 285 (λημόνησα); 287 (?); 288 (ἔλαθε με).

the power of the god and the violent threat is then in keeping with the dream-symbolism which, following the fiction of real life, presents the god as the angry owner come to lay hands on a runaway. The whole confession then would be a cunning attempt to discredit the κύριος and to invoke religion in support of Neikon's desire for liberty. The difficulty involved in this theory of accounting for the freedom with which a slave pillories his master is not so great as might appear. The relation of master and slave in the Greek-speaking provinces of the Empire was not that of the Roman republic, and in matters of religion particularly they enjoyed some independence. In this case we should have to assume that Neikon enjoyed a certain measure of protection from the temple authorities. In any case the difficulty is one that arises on any view of Neikon's status, if we assume the κύριος to be still alive and still κύριος when the inscription is set up.

It will be seen that none of these theories offers a completely satisfactory solution of the difficulties of our text. No. 1 gives a fairly reasonable account of the relations of guardian and ward and a good explanation of the action of the god, but it involves difficulties of terminology and makes the language of the god inconsistent with the circumstances assumed; No. 3 succeeds in giving a consistent picture, but it is one that lacks general probability in making the action of the god an arbitrary exercise of power and in imputing a perhaps excessive subtlety to Neikon; No. 4 is in many respects an attractive hypothesis, but it rests on the assumption of a grammatical usage which is perhaps surprising in what we have seen to be, in spite of lapses, a rather carefully composed text. A preference may be expressed for No. 2, which gives an explanation of the text that has the merit of including the details in a consistent picture and of presenting the epiphany and the language of the god in an appropriate light. But this theory too, as we have seen, has difficulties of its own as well as those which it shares with the first.

We must therefore admit failure to reach an entirely satis-

factory conclusion. An exact interpretation of the phrase ἂν πύλας ἰζόμενον would do much to put the attitude of Apollo in a clearer light and so contribute to the understanding of the document as a whole; one of the main objects of this note is to draw the attention of others to this problem, in the hope that an illuminating parallel will be found.

Though we cannot give a solution of all its difficulties the importance of the text is sufficiently clear. Its linguistic form bears upon our view of the nature of the confession inscriptions and the standard of education of the priests and people of the Lairbenos shrine; it raises the important question how far such inscriptions served non-religious purposes; it affords a striking example of dream-epiphany, no doubt influenced by literary forms but still presented as a record of real experience; lastly, it sets an interesting juristic problem involving the question of sacral manumission. It is by reason of its bearing on this last topic that we have treated the text in conjunction with the preceding inscriptions. In spite of difficulties of detail one or two points emerge clearly. In the first place the god, though he may indicate his disapproval, cannot prevent an action of which he disapproves. Secondly, he is conceived as having an interest in manumission, but there is nothing to show that manumission involved a real transference of the slave to the power of the god (i.e. to the service of the temple). The god's appearance in the dream is symbolic and need imply nothing more than the fiction of ownership, a fiction which accounts also, we suggested, for the manumissions κατ' ἐπιταγήν and κατ' εὐχήν. While the god's position, if we are right, was one of merely fictitious ownership, our inscription nevertheless bears witness to a strong religious feeling which might be brought into play to influence men, even in matters apparently of secular rather than religious importance. This feeling might be aroused through the publicity of *stelographia*[92] and we have conjectured that Neikon may have had the aid of the temple authorities in composing a confession which redounded to the glory of god and at the same time served his own practical ends. These

[92] A similar appeal to public opinion plays a part in other epigraphic religious documents; cf. Björck, op. cit., p. 44.

results are of some importance for the question of sacral manumission in general and also for our understanding of the interrelation of religious, legal and social custom in an area where traces of an older theocratic system still lingered under Roman rule.

5

Steinleitner, Die Beicht, p. 47, No. 22 (= S.E.G. VI, 252).

. . . . . .
[Ἀτ]θεὶς Ἀγαθημέ-
[ρ]ου ἱερὰ βιαθῖσα
ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ κὲ ἡμα-
ρτῆσα ἐτήκω κολ-
αθέσα ἐπὸ τοῦ θε-
οῦ· ἐπὶ ὃ κ(ὲ) ἐστηλογ-
ράφησεν παραγ-
έλων μηδένα κα-
ταφρονεῖ[ν τοῦ θεοῦ].

The mysterious ἐτήκω of line 4 was interpreted by Steinleitner as a vulgarism for τήκομαι, with appeal to the frequent occurrence of prothesis in the Greek of Asia Minor. The analogy of the prothetic vowel before *s* impure[93] can hardly, however, be applied here. Zingerle resorted to correction and his conjecture ἐ(π)ήκω (= ἐφήκω) has been accepted by the editors of S.E.G. Pettazoni (op. cit., p. 138, n. 56) more wisely regards the matter as doubtful. The true reading may be obtained by the removal of one stroke in the first letter, which gives us a well known late Greek verb στήκω[94] and with it an interesting addition to the late forms and usages of this group of inscriptions. It is clear that in στήκω κολαθέσα we have an example of a periphrasis which is characteristic of later Greek. Periphrasis of this kind[95] with the verbs εἶναι, γίγνεσθαι and ὑπάρχειν is not uncommon from classical times onwards, but the similar use of ἵστασθαι does not seem to be noted in the grammatical text-

[93] Thumb, Hellen., pp. 144 ff.

[94] Psaltes, op. cit., p. 245; Mayser (1906), p. 353.

[95] Kühner, II, 1, pp. 38 ff.; Stahl, pp. 144 ff.; Jannaris, § 2140; Schmid, Att. III, pp. 112 ff.; Psaltes, p. 230.

books. Without making a special search we may find sufficient evidence to confirm it. Babrius, for example, is fond of using εἰστήκει in a similar way; thus in 68, 8 διαβὰς εἰστήκει; 77, 1 δεδηχὼς εἰστήκει; 122, 1 πατήσας εἰστήκει. That εἰστήκει in these instances is playing the part of ἦν in periphrasis is suggested by its use with adjectives, as in 72, 6 ὕδωρ διαυγὲς εἰστήκει and 74, 7 συντράπεζος εἰστήκει. The same usage of ἵστασθαι occurs in Byzantine Greek, though it is not recorded by Psaltes from the historians. It is found, for example, in the military writer[96] edited by Vári, ὁδὸς φθάζουσα ἵσταται (p. 14, l. 11). These examples are sufficient to show the use of ἵστασθαι in a weakened sense which approaches that of εἶναι,[97] a use which is perhaps to be traced in its beginnings in such a phrase as εἰστήκει τηρῶν in Aristophanes.[98]

It is not quite certain that the construction is to be regarded as a mere vulgarism. Periphrasis is rather affected by the Atticisers[99] and the use of the aorist participle instead of the perfect distinguishes our case from the modern perfect passive. The explanation of the aorist participle lies, however, in the fact that our text antedates its disappearance but belongs to a period when all feeling for the distinction between aorist and perfect had been lost.[100]

It may be remarked in conclusion that this use is an interesting example of parallel development in Greek and Latin; the weakened use of *sto* and its use in periphrasis with participles are familiar in Italian and Spanish.[101]

[96] Inc. Scr. Byz. de re mil. (Teubner, 1901); cf. also p. 7, l. 12 (πεπυκνωμέναι στηκέτωσαν), p. 11, l. 21 (στηκέτωσαν ἀπέχοντα).

[97] In modern Greek στέκω supplies missing forms of εἶμαι, Thumb, Handb., p. 152.

[98] Aves 513; cf. ἐκάθητο in l. 510. See ibid. 515,831; Eccles. 782. The word ἔστηκα in Eccles. 879 (cf. Pax 256) is to be taken similarly and is far too weak to bear the weight of Fraenkel's conclusions as to the mise en scène (Greek Poetry and Life, pp. 262 ff.).

[99] Schmid, III, p. 114 (Eleganz).

[100] In the classical period εἶναι with the aorist participle appears to be poetic, but it is common in later prose; see the examples in Schmid, loc. cit., and Psaltes, p. 230.

[101] Professor Löfstedt refers me to Stud. Neophil. XI, p. 185, n. 1.

PARADISE LOST

GRANT McCOLLEY

Smith College

Among the significant questions perennially raised by Miltonic criticism, the two most important are the two most variously answered: What is Paradise Lost, and why did Milton write it? [1] If the evidence which follows may be regarded as sufficiently exhaustive, I suggest that Paradise Lost was designed as a non-sectarian epic and more or less deliberately modelled as well as based upon conservative religious literature. The second conclusion is that Milton wrote his greatest poem to justify the ways of the Christian God, and to give artistic-prophetic expression to beliefs which were both vital and sacred to him.[2]

As Professors Frank E. Robbins and Maury Thibaut de Maisières have amply demonstrated, Paradise Lost follows in general scope and major divisions the somewhat amorphous genre known as hexaemeral literature.[3] This genre began its development at least as early as Philo, and grew in popularity and diversity of treatment until some decades after 1600. It

[1] I wish to make the point that the present essay is not concerned with the problem of the ultimate or immediate sources of Paradise Lost. The question of Milton's use of a number of the writers discussed will be considered in another place.

[2] In keeping with all students of Milton, I am indebted to more works than it is possible to name. I may mention however Henry J. Todd, Poetical Works of Milton, London, 1809; Margaret L. Bailey, Milton and Jakob Boehme, New York, 1914; Marianna Woodhull, The Epic of Paradise Lost, New York, 1907, especially the digests of Grotius, Adamus Exsul, and Vondel, Adam in Ballingschap; George Coffin Taylor, Milton's Use of Du Bartas, Cambridge, 1934; James Holly Hanford, A Milton Handbook, New York, 1938; Arnold Williams, 'Commentaries on Genesis as a Basis for Hexaemeral Literature,' SP, XXXIV (1937), 191–208; various studies by Marjorie H. Nicolson, particularly those cited below and 'Milton and Hobbes,' SP, XXIII (1926), 405–433; and to P. E. Dustoor, 'Legends of Lucifer in Early English and in Milton,' Anglia LIV (1930), 213–268, the last of which Professor Douglas Bush was so courteous as to call to my attention. I also am indebted to the Library of Congress, Catholic University, Chicago, Cornell, Harvard, Michigan, Yale, and Union Theological Seminary for the loan of rare books.

[3] Frank E. Robbins, The Hexaemeral Literature, Chicago, 1912; Thibaut de Maisières, Les Poèmes inspirés du Début de la Genèse à l'Époque de la Renaissance, Louvain, 1931.

was a favorite of medieval writers, who included discussion of the attributes of God, of the angels and the fall of the apostates, of the creation of the world and man, of his fall, restoration through the Incarnation, and of the last Judgment.[4] The Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and early Seventeenth Centuries brought to it a new wave of popularity, with further expansion and diversification.[5] Among its important forms was that which Thibaut terms the 'celestial cycle,' a trilogy which described the rebellion and battle in Heaven, the creation of the world, and the fall of man.[6] To the last was frequently appended a paraphrase of subsequent Biblical history.[7]

That Milton followed the conventional celestial cycle is however but one part of the story. Within the principal divisions of this cycle he placed many major and minor themes common to religious literature in general.[8] Some exceptions excluded, these themes or episodes were as widely respected as they were

[4] Cf. H. O. Taylor, The Mediaeval Mind, bk. VII, 135.

[5] This expansion and diversification led to works which, without excluding the remaining themes, emphasized chiefly, (1) the battle of the angels, (2) the creation of the world, or, (3) the creation and fall of man. Among books not cited or mentioned briefly which illustrate the three types, or a combination of two, are the following:

(1) Amico Aguifilio, Il Caso di Lucifero, Crescimbeni; Antonio Alfano, La Battaglia Celeste, Palermo, 1568; Giacinto Verallo, La Guerra degli Angeli, 1623; Trébuchement de Lucifer, in Mistère du Viel Testament, ed. Rothschild et Picot, Paris, 1878–91.

(2) Alonzo Acevedo, Creacion del Mundo, Rome, 1615; Alcimus Avitus, De Initio Mundi, Paris, 1545; Antonio Cornazono, Creazione del Mondo, 1472; Gasparo Murtola, Della Creazione del Mondo, Venice, 1608 (Battle in Heaven, Canto I); Felice Passero, L'Essamerone, Venice, 1609.

(3) Création d'Adam et d'Eve, ed. Rothschild et Picot, op. cit.; Troilio Lancetta, La Scena Tragica d'Adamo, Venice, 1644; Lope de Vega, Creacion del Mundo y Primera Culpa del Hombre (poem); Luis de Camoens, Creação . . . do Homem, Lisbon, 1615; François Pona, L'Adamo, ?1664; Giovanni Soranzo, Dell' Adamo, Genova, 1604; Serafino della Salandra, Adamo Caduto, Cozenzo, 1647.

[6] Op. cit., pp. 1 ff.

[7] Cf. Caedmon and Valmarana, as cited below.

[8] It is not my thought to minimize Milton's extended indebtedness to the Classics. The exigencies of space require however that I refer the reader to the editions of Newton and Todd, and particularly to Charles Grosvenor Osgood, The Classical Mythology of Milton's English Poems, New York, 1900; Gilbert Murray, The Classical Tradition in Poetry, Cambridge, 1927, Ch. I (pp. 7–22); and Douglas Bush, Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry, 1932, Ch. XIV. Comprehensive studies of the relation of Milton's ideas to those of rabbinical writers will be found in Harris F. Fletcher, Milton's Rabbinical Readings, Urbana, 1930, and the essays cited p. 317.

traditional.[9] Since Milton was as individualistic as he was well-read, his employment of conceptions and situations generally both commonplace and orthodox must have resulted from deliberate choice.[10]

[9] In view of Professor Taylor's study of the commonplaces in Paradise Lost, op. cit., Ch. II, I not infrequently have either omitted or have mentioned in passing only those which he discussed. His list includes (1) various attributes and functions of God, (2) of Angels, (3) Time, (4) Chaos, (5) Platonism, (6) the Six Days, (7) Matter, (8) Evil, (9) Adam and Man, (10) Effects of the Fall, (11) the Soul, (12) Scheme of Salvation of Man, (13) Theory of Knowledge.

[10] To the end that documentary footnotes may be held within a reasonable space, the following works will be cited only by author, or where clarity demands, by author and title. The same method will be followed after the first citation of works not included in this list. The works of the Fathers cited in subsequent sections but not given here are from Migne's edition: Henry Ainsworth, Annotations upon the Five Bookes of Moses, London, 1639; Saint Augustine, City of God, tr. Rev. Marcus Dods, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, New York, 1907; Gervase Babington, Workes, London, 1615; Saint Basil, Opera Omnia, Paris, 1839; Joseph Beaumont, Psyche, London, 1648; Saint Bonaventure, Opera Omnia, Paris, 1864; ?Caedmon, Metrical Paraphrase, tr. Benjamin Thorpe, London, 1832; John Calvin, Commentaries on the First Book of Moses, tr. John King, Edinburgh, 1847; Georgius Cedrenus, Compendium Historiarum, ed. B. G. Niebuhr, Bonnae, 1838 (Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae); Abraham Cowley, Poems, ed. A. R. Waller, Cambridge, 1905; Richard Crashaw, Sospetto d' Herode, tr. of Marini's Strage degli Innocenti (cited as Crashaw-Marini), Poems of Richard Crashaw, ed. L. C. Martin, Oxford, 1927; John Damascene, Opera Omnia, Paris, 1712; Giovanni Diodati, Pious Annotations Upon the Holy Bible, London, 1643; Du Bartas, Divine Weekes and Workes, tr. Josuah Sylvester (cited as Du Bartas), London, 1621; Edward, Earl of Clarendon, A Brief View and Survey of the . . . Leviathan (cited as Clarendon), Oxford, 1676; Book of Enoch, tr. R. H. Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, II, Oxford, 1912; Joseph Fletcher, The Historie of the Perfect-Cursed-Blessed Man, London, 1629; Godfrey Goodman, The Fall of Man, London, 1616 (Film copy, by courtesy of the University of Cincinnati); Thomas Heywood, The Hierarchie of the blessed Angells. . . . The Fall of Lucifer, London, 1635; Peter Heylyn, Cosmography, London, 1674; Book of Jubilees, ed. Charles, op. cit; Franciscus Junius, Testamenti Veteris . . . brevibusque scholiis illustrati ab Immanuele Tremellio et Francisco Junio, Geneva, 1590; Jacob Masenius, Sarcotis, ed. J. Dinouart, Coloniae Agrippinae, 1757; John Mercer, Commentarius in Genesin, 1598; Marin Mersenne, Quaestiones Celeberrimae in Genesim, Paris, 1623; ibid., Observationes et Emmendationes, Paris, 1623; Henry More, Complete Poems, ed. Alexander Grosart, Chertsey Worthies' Library, 1878; Old English Hexameron, tr. S. J. Crawford, Hamburg, 1921; Origen, The Writings of Origen, tr. Frederick Crombie, Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Edinburgh, 1869; Benedict Pererius (Pereira), Commentariorum . . . in Genesim, Moguntiae, 1612; Peter Lombard, Libri IV Sententiarum, studio et cura PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 2nd ed., 1916; Thomas Peyton, The Glasse of Time, London, 1620, as reprinted by John B. Alden, New York, 1886; Philo, On the Account of the World's Creation Given by Moses, tr. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker (Loeb Library), New York, 1929; Samuel Purchas, Purchas His Pilgrimage, London, 1626;

I — A

The action of Paradise Lost is opened against the background of almost infinite time.[11] Aeons before God built the world, He had created the angels, and erected in Heaven a vast empire. The central conception that angels had existed long before the world was scarcely the conventional belief of the Seventeenth and earlier centuries. However, as Milton took pains to point out, it had been 'the opinion of many ancient Fathers.' [12] He might well have added that the conception had never been heterodox. St. Thomas regarded it as less probable than the interpretation that 'angels were created at the same time as corporeal creatures,' [13] but declared the idea 'is not to be deemed erroneous; especially on account of the opinion of Gregory Nazianzen, "whose authority in Christian doctrine is of such

---

Francis Quarles, Poetical Works, ed. George Gilfillan, Edinburgh, 1857; Sir Walter Ralegh, Historie of the World, London, 1634; George Sandys, A Relation of a Journey . . ., London, 1621; John Selden, De Dis Syris, London, 1617; Anthony Stafford, Niobe, or His Age of Teares, London, 1611; John Swan, Speculum Mundi, 2nd ed. enlarged, Cambridge, 1643; Georgius Syncellus, Chronographia, ed. W. Dindorf, Bonnae, 1829 (Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae); Torquato Tasso, Del Mondo Creato (Le Sette Giornate del Mondo Creato), ed. Angelo Solerti, Bologna, 1891; ibid., Jerusalem Delivered, tr. Edward Fairfax, London, 1687; Friderich Taubman, Bellum Angelicum, in Melodaesia, Lipsiae, 1655; Saint Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica, tr. Fathers of the English Dominican Province, London, 1922; Alonso Tostatus (Tostado), Commentaria in Genesim, Venice, 1728; George Turberville, Eglogs, London, 1567 (photostatic copy); Odorico Valmarana, Daemonomachiae, sive de Bello Intelligentiarum Libri XV, Bononiae, 1623 (This edition apparently was unknown to Lauder and Newton, who cite the revised and enlarged edition, in twenty-five books, published in Vienna, 1627, under the title, Demonomachiae, sive de Bello Intelligentiarum super Divini Verbi Incarnatione. Lauder reprinted the first book of this edition, London, 1753.); Erasmo di Valvasone, L'Angeleida, with preface by Q. Viviani, Undine, 1825; Justus van den Vondel, Lucifer, tr. Leonard Charles van Noppen, New York, 1898; Andrew Willet, Hexapla in Genesin, London, 1608; Johan Wolleb, Abridgment of Christian Divinitie, tr. . . . and in some obscure places cleared and enlarged by Alexander Ross (cited as Wolleb-Ross), 3rd ed., London, 1660.

[11] I refer to the chronological beginning of Paradise Lost, V, 577 ff. All quotations other than those from contemporary works are more or less modernized in spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and method of indicating quotations within the text.

[12] Paradise Lost, I, Argument. Milton may have included Ambrose, De Incarnat. Dom. Sacr. 16; Basil, In Hexaemeron Homilia I, 5; Gregory Nazianzen, Oratio XXXVIII, 9; Isidorus, Sent., I, x, 4; and Jerome, Epist. ad Tit., I² (PL VII, 594).

[13] Summa Theologica, I, 61, 3.

weight that no one has ever raised objection to his teaching" . . . as Jerome says.' [14] Among later theologians Andrew Willet described the question as 'not a matter of faith,' [15] and the poet Du Bartas found it unimportant whether the angelic host was created on the first day, on the fourth, or prior to the creation of the world:

> Whether this day [first] God made you, angels bright,
> Under the name of Heaven, or of the Light:
> Whether you were, after, in the instant born
> With those bright spangles that the heavens adorn:
> Or, whether you derive your high descent
> Long time before the world and firmament,
> I nil [will not] stiffly argue to and fro
> In nice opinions, whether so, or so.[16]

In addition to being unoffensive to authoritative representatives of various creeds and nations, the conception had some popularity among other poets who described or alluded to the rebellion and battle in Heaven. Caedmon employed it in the Seventh Century, Spenser in the late Sixteenth, and in the Seventeenth, Odorico Valmarana and Justus van den Vondel.[17] Milton patently had ample precedent for the belief that the angels were created prior to the world.

During a convocation held on Heaven's great year,[18] the God of Paradise Lost announced tc the angels the Incarnation and Exaltation of the Son, and commanded that all knees should bow to Him. Insulted and angered by this seemingly arbitrary decree, Satan determined to revolt.[19] The conception that God

[14] Ibid.

[15] Op. cit., p. 17. See also Augustine, City of God, XI, 32; Pererius, I, 2 (sec. 194).

[16] Op. cit., I (First Day), 589 ff.

[17] Caedmon, pp. 1 ff.; Spenser, An Hymne of Heavenly Love, sts. 4 ff.; Valmarana, pp. 1 ff.; Vondel, Lucifer, Acts II, IV (pp. 321 ff., 387). Cf. Develis Perlament, ll. 329 ff.

[18] Cf. Job 1. 6 and Rupertus, De Victoria Verbi Dei, I, 26.

[19] P. L., V, 569 ff. The interpretation that Satan rebelled because of the Incarnation apparently was less widely accepted than the belief, based on the current gloss of Isaiah 14. 12–16 (and on Ezekiel 28. 2 ff.), that 'Lucifer' revolted because he desired to be 'like the Most High.' Milton utilized this interpretation at the opening of Paradise Lost, I, 38 ff.

> [Satan] Aspiring to set himself in glory above his peers,
> He trusted to have equalled the Most High . . . and . . .
> Raised impious war in Heaven and battle proud.

revealed to the angels the future Incarnation of the Son may be considered a commonplace of Christian thought.[20] Less conventional, but apparently widely known, was the belief that this revelation and the Exaltation of Christ occasioned the rebellion and battle in Heaven. In the succinct statement of Thomas Heywood:

> [God] did not reveal his blessed Son's Incarnation, but with a strict commandment that they [the angels] should with all creatures God and Man [Christ] obey. Hence grew the great dissention that befell betwixt Lucifer and the Prince Michael.[21]

Milton did not accept however Heywood's conventional interpretation that the 'dissention' in Heaven was 'betwixt Lucifer and the Prince Michael.' [22] He turned rather to the less

---

Among other writers who presented this conception are Acevedo, Creacion, I, 67 ff.; Augustine, op. cit., XI, 15; Caedmon, p. 17; Damascene, De Fide Orth., II, 4; Old English Hexameron, ll. 300 ff.; Calvin, p. 146; J. Fletcher, p. 65; Peter Lombard, II, d. II, 6; Peyton, I, 67; Rupertus, op. cit., I, 10; Stafford, p. 16; Taubman, pp. 78–79; Thomas Aquinas, I, 63, 3; Valvasone, I, 3 ff.

A third conception, normally the least important, but made by Vondel the principal theme of his Lucifer (cf. Argument and ff., passim), was that Satan rebelled because the Incarnation had made man higher than the angels. Milton apparently alludes to this conception in IX, 152 ff., and II, 347 ff. In addition to Vondel's Lucifer, where it is used in connection with the normally more important conceptions, the belief will be found in Heywood, pp. 339–40. Damascene declared, De Imaginibus, Orat. III, 26, that man was made higher than the angels by the Incarnation of Christ (the Word), but said nothing of Satan.

As the popular Wolleb-Ross compendium suggests, p. 64, there were those who believed that Scripture 'does not specify' what was the first sin of the Devil and his angels. These writers concluded 'We may more safely with the Apostle, Jude 6, call it a defection from their first original, and a desertion of their proper habitation.'

[20] Saint Thomas stated, I, 57, 5, that 'the mysteries of grace,' of which 'the mystery of the Incarnation is the most excellent,' was 'revealed . . . to the angels.' See also Heywood, p. 342; Vondel, Lucifer, Argument, and Act I (p. 284).

[21] Op. cit., p. 342. See also Beaumont, I, 18, 24; Boehme, Three Principles of the Divine Essence (1619), IV, 65 ff.; Valmarana, pp. 14 ff. Vondel, I (pp. 285 ff.), and Taubman, p. 79, alluded to the idea. Calvin found the belief that Satan revolted because of the Incarnation both illogical and objectionable, and declared, p. 146: 'Curious sophists have feigned that he burned with envy, when he foresaw the Son of God was to be clothed in human flesh; but the speculation is frivolous. For since the Son of God was made man in order to restore us, who were already lost, from our miserable overthrow, how could that be foreseen which would never have happened unless man had sinned?'

[22] Milton of course followed the more common tradition to the extent, VI, 44 ff., of making Michael the leader of the angelic host which for two days waged inconclusive

commonplace idea that Christ was the triumphant victor as well as the innocent cause of the battle in Heaven. The orthodoxy of both this idea and of the various episodes and themes which Milton connected with it is attested by their appearance in De Victoria Verbi Dei, the work of a twelfth century Catholic abbot, Rupertus Tuitiensis. The similarity of the thinking of Rupertus and Milton is best shown by comparison of their statements:

> [Satan] fraught / With envy against the Son of God . . .
> Honoured by his great Father, and proclaimed
> Messiah, King Anointed, could not bear
> Through pride, that sight . . . resolved . . . [to] leave
> Unworshiped, unobeyed, the Throne supreme. . . .[23]

Quod causa rebellionis fuerit superbia et quae fuerint causae superbiendi. Satanas veras adversus Dei Verbum causas inimicitiarum nullas habuit.[24]

> Great Lucifer . . . / Affecting all equality with God . . .
> Assembled all his train . . . and with calumnious art
> Of counterfeited truth thus held their ears . . .
> Thus far his bold discourse without control / Had audience. . . .[25]

Satanam suum ipsius mendacium et caeteris angelis praedicasse, persuasisseque nonnullis, ut se pro Deo haberent. Quomodo hoc autem fieri possit, nisi ipsorum consensu angelorum? Ut igitur in rem procederet quod apud se habebat hujuscemodi consilium, coepit praedicare semetipsum omnibus

---

war with Satan's legions. Rupertus, I, 18 ff., also named Michael as the leader of the loyal angels.

[23] P. L., V, 661 ff. The unnamed and smooth-tongued associate of Satan whom Milton described V, 702 ff., as casting 'ambiguous words and jealousies' while persuading the angels to leave for the quarters of his chief, is basically similar to the unnamed subordinate of the Lucifer of Taubman. Immediately after he had resolved to rebel, Taubman's Lucifer, p. 78:

> . . . Legatis de pluribus eligit unum,
> Ardua qui poterat liquidoque fluentia cursu
> Verba, vel abstruso vel aperto pingere flore;
> Ac dare subtili vivacia dicta catenae,
> Adstrictos quoties in nodum cogere sensus
> Vellet, ut adfectus possessaque corda deorum
> Irent sponte sua verbis quocunque vocasset.

Acevedo, I, 70 ff., provides Satan with quite a different subordinate who, under the name of Discord, incited revolt by violent and open expression of hatred to God.

[24] Op. cit., I, 8.

[25] P. L., V, 760 ff. Lucifer is addressing the third of the angels which he had led to the North. The basis of the two beliefs which Milton combined here, that Satan's

angelis, confidens ut erat plenus sapientia, quod efficaciam haberet ad persuadendum, ut crederetur sibi dicenti: 'Ego feci memetipsum, Deus ego sum.' [26]

From the persuasive exhortation by which Satan established himself as 'God,' Milton and Rupertus turned to the question of who created the angels. The Protestant and the Roman Catholic described Satan as declaring that angels were self-begot, and set this declaration in sharp contrast with the interpretation, a gloss of John 1. 1 ff., that Christ had created the angels:

> [Abdiel to Satan] Thyself . . . dost thou count . . .
> Equal to him, begotten Son, by whom,
> As by his Word, the mighty Father made
> All things, even thee, and all the Spirits of Heaven.[27]

Solius Verbi Dei testimonio convictum Satanam. . . . Sed ecce 'in principio erat Verbum. . . .' Hoc Verbum, hic Deus testis esse debuit, et testis esse potuit verus et idoneus, quod Satanas ille falsus esset, quod mendacium loqueretur. Nam ipse est 'super omnes. . . .' [28]

> [Satan to Abdiel] That we were formed, then, say'st thou?
> And the work / Of secondary hands, by task transferred
> From Father to his Son? Strange point and new! . . .
> Who saw / When this creation was? Remember'st thou

---

domain lay in the North, and that the angels he seduced numbered one-third of Heaven's host, was the contemporary interpretation of Isaiah 14. 13, and Revelation 12. 4. These beliefs previously had been combined and used as Milton combined and used them by Valmarana, p. 17. The conception of Milton, V, 683 ff., that prior to his fall Satan ruled over a third of the angels of Heaven will be found in the anonymous Discourse of Devils and Spirits, V, 34. This treatise was printed as an appendix to the London, 1665, edition of Reginald Scot's Discovery of Witchcraft. It is not to be confused with Scot's Discourse of Divels and Spirits, which is a part of the Discovery.

The interpretation of Milton and Rupertus that Satan persuaded and did not command his associates to rebel against God harmonizes with that of St. Thomas, I, 63, 8: 'The sin of the highest angel was the cause of the others sinning; not as compelling them, but as inducing them by a kind of exhortation.' See also Caedmon, pp. 18–19.

[26] Ibid., I, 11.

[27] P. L., V, 833 ff. The faithful Abdiel of Milton, who rebuked Satan and attempted by argument to dissuade him and the angels from rebellion, has partial counterparts in the Fama of Valvasone, I, 18 ff., and the Gabriel and Raphael of Vondel, II (pp. 307 ff.), IV (pp. 386 ff.). Both Abdiel, V, 864 ff., and Raphael, IV (p. 387), are ordered by Satan to bear to God the threat of war. Heywood's Michael, p. 340, charged Lucifer with attempting to introduce 'innovations' into Heaven, a complaint made in Paradise Lost, V, 679, by Satan.

[28] Op. cit., I, 13.

Thy making, while the Maker gave thee being?
We know no time when we were not as now;
Know none before us, self-begot, self-raised
By our own quickening power. . . .[29]

Satanam neminem creationis et conditionis suae conscium putasse, ideoque nullius contra se testimonium veritum fuisse. Quem putaret posse esse ex omnibus angelis, qui dicente ipso: Ego creatura Dei non sum, ego a nullo factus sum, sed 'ego feci memetipsum (Ezech. xxix)' obviaret et diceret: Falsum tu loqueris? [Cf. Ezek. 28. 2: . . . and thou hast said, I am a God.] . . . At vero cunctorum spirituum sive angelorum nullus vidit vel audivit, quando illum fecit Deus. . . . Sic elevat te cor tuum, et sic tumet contra Deum spiritus tuus. . . . Cum igitur nullum haberet ex omnibus angelis conscium suae creationis. . . .[30]

In the subsequent battle in Heaven, Christ conquered Satan by terrifying him and his host with fire and thunderbolt:

Full soon / Among them He arrived, in his right hand
Grasping ten thousand thunders . . . from the living wheels . . .
Every eye / Glared lightning, and shot forth pernicious fire. . . .[31]

Sed quae vel qualia fuerunt vel sunt arma, quibus . . . in illo praelio usi sunt? Non utique arma materialia fuerunt, sed . . . igne ardente: in ipsis

[29] P. L., V, 853 ff. Among many others, the co-eternality of the angels with God is discussed and rejected by Augustine, City of God, XII, 15; and Thomas Aquinas, I, 61, 2.

[30] Ibid., I, 12.

[31] P. L., VI, 834 ff. Milton's belief that Christ was the conqueror of Satan in the battle in Heaven is also set forth in The Christian Doctrine, I, 9, where he interpreted Rev. 12. 7–8 as describing Michael and Satan as 'separating after a doubtful conflict,' and concluded that 'Christ vanquished the Devil, and trampled him under foot singly.' A similar conclusion appears in Beaumont, I, 18 and V, 36.

As the pertinent works cited above in notes 5 and 10 have indicated, there were few themes more interesting to the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries than the battle in Heaven. In general, following Rev. 12. 7 ff., this battle was built around Michael and Satan. This tradition Milton followed in the conflict of the first day. He included the conventional verbal warfare and personal combat between these two leaders, and the common epic mixture of mass fighting and separate struggles between lesser figures. To the relatively conventional subordinates of Michael — Gabriel, Raphael, and Uriel (cf. Vondel, Lucifer, passim, and Valmarana, pp. 26–27) — he added with Valmarana and others names either coined or selected. The second day of the battle is a mixture of the old and the new — the employment of artillery newly invented by Satan, and the hurling of great mountains. As various critics have noted, Valvasone, II, 20–21, ascribed to Satan the invention of artillery for use against God's angels, and Ariosto, Orlando Furioso, IX, 28, Drayton, Polyolbion, Song 18, and Spenser, Faerie Queene, I, vii, 13, attributed to Satan or Hell the creation of firearms. Whether Milton's alteration of the *rocks* flung in Hesiod, Theogony, ll. 674 ff., 713 ff., to mountains was regarded by him as supported by Du Bartas, Decay, ll. 976 ff., probably must remain an open question.

namque est Verbum Dei. Etenim ignis, iste intolerabilis quidem est impiis et odientibus se. . . .[32]

> [The rebel host] astonished, all resistance lost,
> All courage; down their idle weapons dropt . . .
> Pernicious fire . . . withered all their strength,
> And of their wonted vigour left them drained,
> Exhausted, spiritless, afflicted, fallen.[33]

De eo quod in Psalmis scriptus est: 'Tu terribilis es, et quis resistet tibi? extunc ira tua.' . . . Ille qui videbatur sibi fortissimus, sic inter angelos, quorum volebat esse Dominus. . . . Vere igitur in terribilis es, Deus, et nemo resistit tibi. . . . Et nihil [Satan] sic timet, quam fulmen Verbi Dei. . . . Angeli autem viderunt in magno terrore positi. Sic enim ad beatum Job dicit ipse Dominus: 'Cum sublatus fuerit, timebunt angeli et territi purgabuntur.' [34]

> Yet half his strength he put not forth, but checked
> His thunder in mid-volley. . . . / Nine days they fell. . . .
> Chaos . . . felt tenfold confusion in their fall
> Through his wild Anarchy . . . Hell . . . received them whole . . .
> Hell, their fit habitation, fraught with fire. . . .[35]

'In ignem aeternam, qui paratus est ei et angelis ejus' . . . jam habet poenam incendium fulminis quo fulminatus de coelo cecidit . . . Verbi Omnipotentis, quod ipse est, tonitrum et excutiendum illum, ut de coelo caderet. . . . In grande chaos cecidit.[36]

The celestial battle having ended, discord ceased in Heaven, and the angels sang songs of praise to the victorious Christ:

> I have revealed . . . the discord which befell . . .
> In Heaven . . . Disburdened Heaven rejoiced . . .
> Sole victor, from the expulsion of his foes
> Messiah . . . turned . . . all his Saints . . .
> With jubilee advanced . . . sung triumph, and
> Him sung victorious King. . . .[37]

[32] Ibid., I, 15.

[33] P. L., VI, 838 ff. To use the phrase of Sir Herbert Grierson, Milton here describes Christ as coming forth 'in all the panoply of Ezekiel's vision.' Such a description would have appeared altogether fitting to Rupertus, who, as I point out in 'Milton's Battle in Heaven and Rupert of Saint Heribert,' forthcoming in Speculum, regarded Ezekiel as portraying Christ in this particular vision.

[34] Ibid., I, 16, 17, 23.

[35] P. L., VI, 853 ff. Langland, Piers Plowman, I, 119, and Turberville, fol. 15^{r}, previously had described Satan as falling nine days, and Valmarana, p. 32, as abandoning Heaven, and falling into Chaos and profound night:

> Lucifer in Caelum frendens, ceditque siletque,
> Et Chaos horrendum penetrat, noctisque profunde . . .

[36] Ibid., I, 17, 22, 26.

[37] P. L., VI, 878 ff. The first line occurs in the text after those quoted below it.

Illa victoria magnam cum diabolo et angelis ejus excluserat discordiam . . . fecerat concordiam. . . . Exclusam esse discordiam, magnamque factum in coelo . . . concordiam. . . . Eoque projecto, serenitas pacis coelo rediret. . . . Sublata igitur . . . diabolo cum angelis ejus . . . sancti angeli . . . inciperent canere canticum. . . . Interea dum laudantium atque jubilantium pro victoria Verbi Dei angelorum. . . . Nam et in coelo beatis spiritibus illis exsultantibus pro ipsius Verbi victoria. . . .[38]

Having described the origin of evil in Heaven and the fall of Satan into Hell, Milton prepared in Books I, II, and a portion of III to set forth its origin on earth. This preliminary act, if so it may be called, has two scenes, the first and more important in Hell, the second in the space between Hell and the Paradise of Adam and Eve. Within Milton's flaming Hell is Pandæmonium, 'high capital of Satan and his peers,' and far within its vast hall 'a throne of royal state' upon which 'Satan exalted sat.' [39] Great as is the artistic triumph of the poet in these descriptions, they provide no evidence that he desired to depart from accepted tradition. As the work of Beaumont, Crashaw-Marini, Phineas Fletcher, Tasso, Vondel, and other writers may suggest, it was wholly conventional to place in Hell a city, a court, or a palace,[40] and to describe Satan either as sitting upon a throne or as surrounded by subordinates.[41] Equally traditional were the idea of a council or gathering in Hell,[42] allusion to the battle lost in heaven,[43] utterance of defiance to God,[44] the de-

[38] Ibid., I, 20, 22, 30; II, 1. Book II, 1, follows immediately I, 30. See also I, 19: 'Itaque projecto illo, laudaverunt et jubilaverunt angeli sancti.' . . . The basis of this and similar passages is Job 38. 7: 'And all the sons of God shouted for joy.'

[39] P. L., I, 723 ff.; II, 1 ff.

[40] Beaumont, I, 8 ff.; Fletcher, Apollyonists, I, 18 ff., IV, 5 ff.; Tasso, Gier. Lib., IV, 6 ff., Valmarana, pp. 36 ff.; Valvasone, III, 28.

[41] Beaumont, ibid.; Cowley, p. 245; Crashaw-Marini, sts. 5 ff.; Fletcher, ibid.; Tasso, ibid.; Vondel, Lucifer, V (pp. 424–425).

[42] Beaumont, ibid.; Caedmon, pp. 22 ff.; Cowley, ibid.; Crashaw-Marini, ibid.; Fletcher, ibid.; Tasso, ibid.; Valmarana, ibid.; Valvasone, III, 17 ff.; Vondel, ibid. Cf. P. L., II, 1 ff.

[43] Beaumont, I, 18; Caedmon, p. 23; Fletcher, II, 15 ff.; Tasso, ibid., Vondel, Adam, I, 1. Cf. P. L., II, 11 ff. passim.

[44] Beaumont, 16 ff.; Caedmon, pp. 23 ff.; Fletcher, ibid., II, 15 ff.; Masenius, pp. 8 ff., 84 ff.; Valmarana, ibid. Cf. P. L., I, 106 ff., and passim. Fletcher's Apollyon declared he had a 'heart unbroke, which neither Hell can daunt, nor Heaven appease,' and the Satan of Beaumont vowed he would never surrender to God:

> I yield not yet; Defiance, Heaven, said he,
> And though I cannot reach thee with my fire,

cision to wage a new or second war on Deity,[45] and initiation of a plan for the seduction of mankind.[46]

From the point of view of the ideas involved, the major episode in Satan's voyage from Hell to Paradise is his meeting with the Archangel Uriel. Imbedded within Milton's description of this meeting are five conceptions, but again none suggests any desire to be heterodox. The first, that Uriel was the regent of the Sun, is the idea set forth by Henry More in his note: 'Uriel, ignis Dei, Angelus Meridionalis; He that rules in the power of the Meridian Sun.' [47] St. Bonaventure described Uriel, 'lucens Deo . . . vel ignis Dei,' as one of the four major angels, and the anonymous author of the Discourse of Devils made him the ruler of the stars, the planets, and their influences.[48] The related conception of Uriel as the angel who revealed the secrets of the heavenly bodies is that found in I Enoch, Syncellus, and Cedrenus.[49] The third concept, that Satan could disguise himself as a good angel, is implicitly supported by St. Paul in 2 Corinthians 11. 14, and was accepted by such stalwarts of conservatism as Du Bartas, Beaumont, and Peyton.[50] St. Thomas will serve, I believe, as adequate

---

Or scepter, yet my brain shall able be
To grapple with thee, nor canst thou be higher
Than my brave spite: Know, though below I dwell,
Heaven has no stouter hearts than live in Hell.

The theme of defiance of God is implicit in the Lucifer of Vondel, V (p. 425), where this character called upon his associates 'With hate irreconcilable and furious craft, the Heavens to persecute and circumvent.'

[45] Andreini, I, ii; Beaumont, I, 33 ff.; Caedmon, pp. 25 ff.; Valmarana, pp. 49 ff.; Vondel, Adam, I, 1 ff. Cf. P. L., I, 656 ff., II, 344 ff.

[46] Andreini, I, iv; Caedmon, pp. 27 ff.; Masenius, ibid.; Valmarana, ibid.; Valvasone, III, 18 ff.; Vondel, Lucifer, V (pp. 425 ff.). The Lucifer of Valvasone here asserted his intention 'Esser primo Signor d'un altro mondo,' and declared 'Ma vinca il Ciel, tanto sei qui piu degno, / Quanto Re in Cielo avesti, in terra hai regno.' Cf. P. L., ibid., and I, 263: 'Better to reign in Hell than serve in Heaven.'

[47] P. L., III, 621 ff.; More, Psychozoia, III, 1, note.

[48] Bonaventure, Centiloquium, III, 18; Discourse, V, 34. See also Harris F. Fletcher, op. cit., pp. 234 ff.

[49] P. L., III, 708 ff. I Enoch, xx, 2; xxxiii, 2 ff., lxxii, 1 ff.; Syncellus, I, 60; Cedrenus, pp. 17, 21. For a detailed discussion of the similarities between the Uriel of I Enoch and Milton, see 'The Book of Enoch and Paradise Lost,' Harvard Theological Review, XXXI (1938), 24 ff.

[50] P. L., III, 636 ff. Du Bartas, Imposture, ll. 251 ff. (allusion); Beaumont, XVIII, 23 ff.; Peyton, I, 68. The Satan of Beaumont was so bold as to enter Heaven itself.

sponsor for the idea that 'God alone' and not man or angel can so probe inner thoughts as to detect hypocrisy.[51] As Milton's Satan obtained from Uriel necessary information regarding the whereabouts of his victim, so the Satan of Beaumont obtained this from Christ.[52] I may add that as the Satan of Paradise Lost moved upon Eden the Sun recalled to him the height from which he fell, the battle in Heaven, and led at last to expression of wrath and defiance.[53] As Beaumont's Lucifer passed 'through the spheres,' similar thoughts came to him.[54]

B

As my few passing references have perhaps suggested, Milton apparently advanced no untoward conception of angels in the sections of Paradise Lost thus far considered. His description of angels as embattled warriors was supported by Revelation 12. 7 ff., not to mention the many works which set forth in some detail the conflict in Heaven.[55] Equally conservative are the interpretations of the nature of spiritual beings scattered within his narrative:

> For Spirits, when they please, / Can either sex assume,
> Or both; so soft / And uncompounded is their essence pure,
> Not tied or manacled with joint or limb,
> Nor founded on the brittle strength of bones . . .
> In what shape they choose, / Dilated or condensed,
> Bright or obscure, / Can execute their aery purposes,
> And works of love or enmity fulfil.[56]

He could not withstand however the 'lightning . . . of Jesu's eyes,' and at the last 'his polished looks, his curled grove of hair . . . and all the stolen things' of his disguise dropped away.

[51] P. L., III, 681 ff. Thomas Aquinas, I, 57, 4.

[52] P. L., III, 733 ff. Beaumont, XVIII, 36 ff.

[53] P. L., IV, 32 ff.

[54] Ibid., 25.

[55] The description in P. L., V, 429 ff., of the 'mellifluous dews' and the 'pearly grain' enjoyed by the angels in Heaven has the support of the King James Version, literally interpreted, cf. Psalms 78. 24–25: [God] 'had rained down manna upon them to eat, and had given them of the corn of heaven. 25 Man did eat of angels' food: he sent them meat to the full.' In the Lucifer of Vondel, I (p. 269), Beelzebub spoke of 'our . . . food celestial.' The angels of Paradise Lost, V, 633 ff., who 'quaff immortality' by drinking 'rubied nectar' perhaps may be compared with those of Du Bartas, described in the Vocation, ll. 1125 ff., as 'carousing nectar of eternity.' Milton also stated in effect, V, 570 ff., that he spoke figuratively.

[56] P. L., I, 423 ff. See also I, 789–790; IV, 985 ff.; VIII, 624 ff. Cf. Ainsworth, p. 3; Caedmon, p. 31; Du Bartas, I, 600 ff., Vocation, ll. 1079 ff.; Heywood, pp. 193,

> Spirits, that live throughout / Vital in every part . . .
> Cannot but by annihilating die; / Nor in their liquid
> Texture mortal wound / Receive, no more than . . . fluid air.[57]

Exclusive of minor details, Milton's characterization of individual angels was either conventional or adequately supported by substantial precedent.[58] To depict Michael as the military chief of the loyal spirits was to follow both Scripture and a practice almost universal. Prior to Paradise Lost, Taubman, Valmarana, and Vondel had made Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, and Uriel the principal historical angels in the conflict between God and Satan.[59] Their employment as major angels throughout the epic accorded with St. Bonaventure, whose catalogue of the four chief spirits included Uriel with the more conventional Michael, Raphael, and Gabriel.[60] They were in addition the four archangels described in the fragment of I Enoch preserved by Syncellus, extracted from Syncellus by Scaliger, and translated from Scaliger by Purchas.[61]

The evil spirits who animate much of Books I–II, V–VI of

---

210 ff.; More, Psychathanasia, III, iii, 27 ff.; Peter Lombard, I, d. VIII, 4; Thomas Aquinas, I, q. 50 ff.; Wolleb-Ross, pp. 51, 64; and the anonymous Discourse of Devils and Spirits, I, 4.

[57] P. L., VI, 344 ff. Milton's description, II, 546 ff., of the fallen angels discussing theology, indulging in music and investigating physical phenomena, harmonized with the conception cited by Heywood, p. 441: 'Some theologists affirm them pregnant in theology. In music they are skilled, expert in physics . . .' etc., and by Wolleb-Ross, p. 64: 'There remained in them . . . their natural knowledge . . . experimental knowledge . . . etc.'

[58] Further discussion of Milton's characterization of particular angels and conceptions of angels in general will be found in the introduction to Section III.

[59] P. L., VI, 44 ff., 250 ff., 354 ff. Taubman, pp. 96 ff.; Valmarana, pp. 26–27; Vondel, Lucifer, Dramatis Personae, and passim, especially Act IV. Taubman and Valmarana supplement Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, and Uriel with angels whose names apparently had been coined in the fashion of Milton's Abdiel, as Hierameel, Jahiel, and Jediel.

[60] Centiloquium, III, 18. Bonaventure described these four angels in some detail, interpreting their names and setting forth their functions. He said in part of Uriel, that 'per ejus ministerium, illustramur in veritate.' Uriel has of course an important place in 2 Esdras (4. 1 ff.), which with 1 Esdras was included in the Apocrypha of the King James Version. First and Second Esdras of this version are the Third and Fourth Esdras of Roman Catholic Apocrypha.

[61] Syncellus, pp. 20 ff., 42 ff.; Scaliger, Thesaurus Temporum . . . Notae, Leyden, 1606, pp. 244 ff.; Purchas, p. 31. In addition to Purchas, John Selden, Syntagma I, i (p. 6), made use of Scaliger's transcription of the Syncellus fragment.

Paradise Lost fall roughly into four groups, the two monsters that guarded the gate of Hell, the warriors who battled in Heaven, the idols of the catalogue of Book I, and the leaders of the infernal council of Book II. The ultimate source of the monsters Sin and Death, daughter-wife and son of Satan, doubtless was James 1. 15: 'Then the lust, when it hath conceived, beareth sin: and the sin, when it is full-grown, bringeth forth death.' Their physical characteristics also were not without adequate precedent among conservative English poets. As various critics have pointed out, the character Sin definitely belongs to the genre of Phineas Fletcher's Hamartia and Spenser's Error:

> [Sin] seemed woman to the waist, and fair,
> But ended foul in many a scaly fold,
> Voluminous and vast — a serpent armed
> With mortal sting. About her middle round
> A cry of Hell-hounds . . . when they list, would creep,
> If aught disturbed their noise, into her womb. . . .[62]

> The first that crept from his detested maw,
> Was Hamartia, foul deformed wight . . .
> A woman seemed she in her upper part. . . .
> The rest, though hid, in serpent's form arrayed,
> With iron scales, like to a plated mail:
> Over her back her knotty tail displayed . . .
> The end was pointed with a double sting. . . .[63]

> Half like a serpent horribly displayed,
> But th' other half did woman's shape retain . . .
> And as she lay upon the dirty ground,
> Her huge long tail her den all overspread . . .
> Pointed with mortal sting. Of her there bred
> A thousand young ones, which she daily fed . . .
> Soon as that uncouth light upon them shone,
> Into her mouth they crept, and sudden all were gone.[64]

Death, referred to by Purchas as 'the deformed issue of Sin,' is in Paradise Lost largely a counterpart of the inseparable characters which Fletcher named Sin and Black Despair.[65]

[62] P. L., II, 650 ff. See also Beaumont, XX, 104, a passage I shall discuss in another place.

[63] Fletcher, Purple Island, XII, 27–28.

[64] Spenser, Faerie Queene, I, i, 14–15.

[65] Purchas, p. 21; P. L., II, 666 ff.; Fletcher, Apollyonists, I, 10, Purple Island, XII, 32 ff. So far as I am aware, Fletcher's character Despair has not heretofore been

The warriors who fought for Satan in the battle in Heaven play no further rôle in the epic. The conflict ended, the names of Ariel and Arioch, Adramelech, Asmadai, Nisroch and Ramiel are heard no more. The taunting Belial of the battle resembles neither the lascivious Belial of the catalogue, nor the astute and cowardly Belial of the high council. The Moloch who 'fled bellowing' from Gabriel is scarcely the destroyer of children described in Book I, and definitely is not the councilor described as 'the strongest and fiercest spirit who fought in Heaven.' These facts suggest that in the battle Milton was chiefly interested in poetically suitable names. However, Belial, Moloch, Ramiel, Adramelech, Asmadai, and Nisroch were well-known either as devils or as heathen gods believed to have been devils.[66] Professor Fletcher concludes, in addition, that Hebrew religious literature justified Milton's employment of Ariel and Arioch as warriors in Heaven.[67]

Miltonic scholarship has long regarded the catalogue of devils of Paradise Lost, I, 391 ff., as an imitation of the catalogues found in the Iliad, Book II, and the Aeneid, Book VII. It also may have been influenced by the catalogue of heroes found in Book I of Tasso's Jerusalem Delivered, or that of the British kings in the Faerie Queene, II, x. Again, Milton may have had in mind the many catalogues of idols and heathen gods such as were set forth by Saint Augustine, Cedrenus, Cowley, Heywood, Selden, Ross, or by the multitude of writers cited by the last.[68]

---

connected with Milton's Death. In P. L., X, 590 ff., Death takes on a different character, one not dissimilar to the Dearth of Du Bartas. Cf. 'Milton's Technique of Source Adaptation,' SP, XXXV (1938), 87. As Dustoor has noted, loc. cit., p. 242, Lydgate previously had described Satan as having committed incest with his daughter Pride.

[66] P. L., VI, 357 ff. (Moloch, Adramelech, Asmadai, Ariel, Arioch, Ramiel), 447 (Nisroch), 620 (Belial). Cf. Cowley, pp. 296, 317 ff.; I Enoch fragment, Syncellus, ibid.; Heywood, pp. 40, 436; Nashe, Pierce Penilesse, ed. Collier, p. 78 (Arioch); Scot, Discovery, ch. 19; Selden, pp. 80 ff., 238.

[67] Op. cit., pp. 256 ff. A brief discussion of the tradition which Milton apparently followed in describing Ariel as a follower of Satan will be found in the present writer's 'Milton's Ariel,' Notes and Queries, CLXXVII (July 15, 1939), 45.

[68] Augustine, City of God, VII, 5 ff.; Cedrenus, pp. 28 ff.; Cowley, pp. 296 ff., 313 ff.; Heywood, p. 436; Selden, ibid., and passim; Alexander Ross, Pansebeia: or, A View of all Religions in the World, 3rd ed., London, 1658, pp. 58 ff. and passim. See also the catalogue of the I Enoch fragment, as cited; and that of Scot, Discovery, XV;

In any event the device, not only of a catalogue, but of a catalogue of heathen deities, appears to have been an orthodox commonplace.

In the high council which convened in Hell, Beelzebub, Belial, and Mammon appear in more or less conventional rôles; the first as the chief associate of Satan, the second as the crafty dissembler who made 'the worse appear the better reason,' and the last as the lover of gems and gold.[69] Moloch appears largely a character fabricated by Milton to play a predetermined rôle — that of presenting the case for open war against the God who so recently had vanquished the rebel host. He has nevertheless a precedent in Fletcher's Apollyonists:

> [Satan] ceased; and next him Moloch, sceptered king,
> Stood up — the strongest and the fiercest spirit
> That fought in Heaven, now fiercer by despair.
> His trust was with the Eternal to be deemed
> Equal in strength, and rather than be less
> Cared not to be at all; with that care lost
> Went all his fear: of God, or Hell, or worse,
> He recked not, and these words thereafter spake:
> 'My sentence is for open war . . . let us . . .
> O'er Heaven's high towers . . . force resistless way.[70]

Discourse, ch. 19. Cowley provided some precedent for describing the heathen deities as an army of warriors:

> Far through an inward scene an army lay,
> Which with full banners a fair fish display,
> Moloch, their bloody God, thrusts out his head . . .
> The double Dagon neither nature saves. . . .

[69] P. L., Beelzebub, II, 299 ff.; Belial, II, 108 ff.; Mammon, I, 679 ff., II, 228 ff. For Beelzebub and Belial see especially Vondel, Lucifer, I (p. 268), and II (p. 319), where the first is described as the chief associate and 'privy councillor' of Satan, and it is said of the second: 'His countenance, smooth-varnished with dissimulation's hue, no master in such deep concealment owns.' See also Scot, Discovery, XV, 2 (Belial); Marlowe, Dr. Faustus, Scene VI, 90 ff. (Beelzebub). Beelzebub appeared in Andreini, I, iii and passim as a major devil. For Mammon, the lover of gold and riches, the basis is probably Matthew 6. 24 and Luke 16. 13. Among others he is described or alluded to by Peter Lombard, II, d. VI, 4 and St. Bonaventure, II, d. VI; by Peyton, II, 160, and by Spenser, Faerie Queene, II, vii, 35–36. Valvasone, III, 19, devoted several lines to a fallen angel, then in Hell, who loved riches and gems. Peter Lombard, II, d. VI, 4, and Bonaventure, II, VI, Art. 3, also set forth the generally received opinion that the fallen angels were divided into hierarchies somewhat similar to those of Heaven.

[70] P. L., II, 43 ff.

> But me, oh never let me, spirits, forget
> That glorious day, when I your standard bore
> And scorning in the second place to sit,
> With you assaulted Heaven, his yoke forswore.
> My dauntless heart yet longs to bleed, and sweat
> In such a fray: the more I burn, the more I hate . . .
> Where are those spirits? Where that haughty race,
> That durst with me invade eternal light? [71]

The last and greatest of the angels in Paradise Lost is Satan, a character long inspiring to both layman and scholar. Generally known as the creation of Milton, he also has been described as the poet himself, and as a personality so powerful that his creator was forced to dismiss him from the stage. Such interpretations contain much that is true, but it remains a fact that the Satan of Books I–II, V–VI is basically a conventional and orthodox figure. In Heaven and in Hell, as later on earth, his character was that traditionally ascribed to him. Prior to his rebellion Satan was:

> Of the first, / If not the first Archangel,
> Great in power, / In favour, and preëminence . . .
> Great indeed / His name, and high was his
> Degree in Heaven . . .[72]
> In the happy realms of light, / Clothed with
> Transcendent brightness, didst outshine / Myriads . . .[73]
> Lifted up so high, I . . . thought one step higher
> Would set me highest. . . .[74]

The Lucifer of Vondel was 'the chief and most illustrious of the angels'; that of Taubman 'beautiful far beyond the rest of the angels, and chief of the spirits.' [75] Quoting Gregory the Great, Hom. 34 in Evang., St. Thomas declared that Satan 'was set over all the host of angels, surpassed them in bright-

[71] Apollyonists, I, 31–32.

[72] P. L., V, 659–661, 706–707. The two principal Scriptural passages which supported the conception of Lucifer as the greatest of the angels appear to have been Ezekiel 28. 14 ff., and Isaiah 14. 12 ff.

[73] P. L., I, 85–87. A second and distinctly minor conception of Satan, apparently alluded to in VI, 262 ff., and perhaps the basis for X, 441 ff., was that he had belonged to a lower order of angels. This conception, advanced among others by Damascene, De Fide Orth. II, 4, was rejected by Thomas Aquinas, I, 63, 7; and discussed by Scot, Discourse, ch. 9.

[74] P. L., IV, 49–51. See also I, 128 ff.; IV, 43 ff.; V, 810 ff.; VII, 131 ff.

[75] Vondel, Lucifer, Argument (p. 263); Taubman, p. 78.

ness, and was by comparison the most illustrious among them.'[76] Heywood eulogized him as the chief who possessed 'the three stupendous qualities of the most holy Trinity . . . Greatness, Wisdom next, then Pulchritude.' Above Michael, above Raphael, above Gabriel, 'was Lucifer instated, honored, exalted, and much celebrated.' [77] The Satan of Marini had been 'the fairest and first-born smile of Heaven.' [78]

In the battle in Heaven described by Milton, as in that of a majority of writers, Satan had proved to be a courageous leader.[79] Such he continued in Hell, both in Paradise Lost and in many related works. Unbroken in spirit by the fall — indeed energized by it — he thought only of a second attack which would bring revenge for his overthrow:

> High on a throne of royal state . . . Satan exalted sat . . .
> Insatiate to pursue / Vain war with Heaven . . .
> 'For, since no deep within her gulf can hold
> Immortal vigour . . . / I give not Heaven for lost. . . .[80]
> [In this place] the happy seat / Of . . . man . . .
> Some advantageous act may be achieved . . .
> And drive . . . / The puny habitants; or, if not drive,
> Seduce them to our party . . . / This would surpass
> Common revenge . . . Thus Beëlzebub / Pleaded his
> Devilish counsel — first devised / By Satan . . .[81]

The Lucifer of Vondel:

> . . . in that dim, infernal consistory,
> High-seated 'mid his Councillors of State,
> With bitter rage 'gainst God he thus began:
> Ye Powers, who for our righteous cause have borne,
> With such fierce pride, this injury, 'tis time
> To be revenged for our wrongs. . . . 'Tis my design
> Both Adam and his seed now to corrupt.[82]

[76] Summa Theologica, I, 63, 7. [77] Op. cit., p. 336. See also p. 331.

[78] Crashaw-Marini, st. 30. Cf. Acevedo, I, 67; Abelard, Sic et Non, 47; Boehme, Regen., II, 46; Bonaventure, II, d. VI, 1, 1; Caedmon, pp. 16, 22; Gregory I, Hom. 34 in Evang., Moral. XXXII, xxiii, 47; Hugo, Sum. Sent., II, 4; Old English Hexameron, ll. 305 ff.; Rupertus, De Vict. Verbi Dei, I, 8; Spenser, An Hymne of Heav. Love, sts. 12, 14; Taubman, p. 78; Valmarana, pp. 10 ff.; Valvasone, I, 3 ff.

[79] P. L., VI, 109 ff. In addition to the works cited in note 5, above, see Taubman, pp. 85 ff.; Valmarana, pp. 26 ff.; Valvasone, II, 19 ff.; Vondel, Lucifer, V (p. 414).

[80] P. L., II, 1 ff. [81] P. L., II, 347 ff.

[82] Lucifer, V (pp. 424–425). See also Andreini, Adam, I, ii and iii; Beaumont, I, 16 ff.; Caedmon, pp. 22 ff.; Fletcher, Apollyonists, I, 18 ff.; Grotius, Adam, I, i; Lancetta, II, iii; Valmarana, pp. 47 ff.; Valvasone, III, 17 ff.; Vondel, Adam, I, i.

In the Summa Theologica, St. Thomas said with Peter Lombard, St. Bonaventure and many others that having once chosen evil the devils must remain confirmed and obstinate in it.[83] In brief, Satan must continue rebellious, proud, and envious of God, or, in the words of St. Anselm, 'it is impossible for the Devil to be reconciled.' [84] Again to quote St. Thomas, the demons also 'are darkened by privation of the light of Grace,' and experience 'fear, sorrow, Joy and the like,' in so far 'as they denote simple acts of the will. . . . The devil is punished with the grief of sorrow.' [85] Such was the interpretation of Marini:

> [Satan] calls to mind the old quarrel . . .
> While new thoughts boiled in his enraged breast,
> His gloomy bosom's darkest character
> Was in his shady forehead seen expressed . . .
> Those stings of care that his strong heart oppressed . . .
> Heaven saw us struggle once: as brave a fight
> Earth now shall see, and tremble at the sight.[86]

Of this tradition is the Satan of Milton's epic:

> . . . What though the field be lost,
> All is not lost — the unconquerable will,
> And study of revenge, immortal hate,
> And courage never to submit or yield . . .[87]
> His form had not yet lost / All her original
> Brightness . . . Darkened so, yet shon
> Above them all the Archangel . . . care
> Sat on his faded cheek. . . . Cruel his eye, but
> Cast / Signs of remorse and passion . . .
> Tears, such as Angels weep, burst forth: [88]

[83] I, 64, 2. Peter Lombard, II, d. VII, 1; Bonaventure, II, d. VII. See also Henricus, Quolib. VIII, 11; Isidore, De Sum. Bono, I, 13; and II, d. VII (with variations as to question and article) of the Sentences of Durandus, Gregorius Ariminus, Ægidius Romanus, John of Bassol, Scotus, and Stephen Brulefer.

[84] Anselm, Cur Deus Homo, II, 22. See also Dialogus de Casu Diaboli, c. xvii.

[85] Summa Theologica, I, 64, 1 and 3. See also the anonymous Discourse of Devils, I, 5–6, 15.

[86] Op. cit., sts. 12 ff.

[87] P. L., I, 105 ff.

[88] P. L., I, 591 ff. Cf. St. Thomas, I, 112, 3, quoting Gregory I, that although Satan had 'lost beatitude, still he has retained a nature like to the angels.'

II

During the Seventeenth and earlier Centuries exposition of the temptation and fall of man normally included some defense of Divine Providence. More often than not the exposition described in detail the Garden of Eden, the temptation, and the principal actors, and set forth the lamentable consequences of man's defection. Milton's exposition of the temptation and fall followed this tradition.

A

Among the beliefs which long had interested Christian writers, few were more widely known than the conception that to some degree man was created to fill the place left vacant by the fallen angels.[89] Origen went so far as to state that his creation was an indirect punishment for the apostates.[90] A more common belief was that man or the elect would wholly or in part repair the damage done Heaven by Satan.[91] Under one interpretation of the Divine Plan, man first was placed upon earth, from which, in the not uncommon conception held by Hugo of Saint Victor, Peter Lombard, and St. Bonaventure, he would rise by humble obedience to the realm of God.[92] The interpre-

[89] Cf. Matthew 22. 30; Luke 20. 36. Anselm (Abp. of Canterbury). Cur Deus Homo, I, 16 ff.; Augustine, City of God, XXII, 1; Enchiridion, XXIX; Beaumont, I, 24; Bonaventure, II, d. IX, 1, 7; II, d. XXI; Caedmon, pp. 6, 25; Catharinus, in Gen. 1. 28; Cornish Creation, ed. Gilbert, London, 1827, p. 21; Hugo of Saint Victor, Summa Sententiarum, III, 4; Old English Hexameron, ll. 324 ff.; Origen, Peri Archon, II, 3; Pererius, IV, 18; Peter Lombard, II, d. I, 5, II, d. XXI, 1 and 7; Rupertus, De Glorificatione Trinitatis, III, 17, 21; Spenser, An Hymne of Heavenly Love, st. 15; Tasso, Gier. Lib., IV, 10; Tostatus, II, 7, and XIII, 420 ff.

[90] Ibid. St. Thomas, I, 65, 2, is among those who cited and rejected Origen's belief.

[91] Of the writers cited in n. 89, see especially Anselm, ibid.; Augustine, ibid.; Caedmon, ibid.; Catharinus, ibid.; Cornish Creation, ibid.; Lombard II, d. I, 5 and II, d. XXI, 7; Spenser, ibid.; Tasso, ibid. Gregory Nazianzen, Orat. XXXVIII, 10 ff., implied that man and the world were created because of the fall of the angels. St. Bonaventure, II, d. IX, 1, 7, rejected the belief that 'solae virgines ad ordines angelorum debent assumi, et ex eis solum ruina angelica restaurari.' Having discussed the question at length, ibid., III, 16–20, Rupertus concluded, III, 21, 'Probabilius dici posse, quod non tam homo propter supplementum angelorum numerum, quam et angeli et hominis propter hominem Jesum Christum facti sunt.'

[92] Hugo, ibid.; Peter Lombard, II, d. XXI, 1; Bonaventure, II, d. XXI, 1.

PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

tation that man would rise to Heaven, Bishop Tostatus carried somewhat further, or made more specific, and declared that man, unfallen, 'poterat beatificari spiritualiter per divinam visionem,' that 'cum autem ascenderet, homo ad talem gradum efficiebatur major,' and that 'ad tale bonum ascenderet.' [93] In utilizing these five related conceptions, Milton skillfully avoided the conflict between the view of Origen and that of later writers by placing the belief of the Greek Father in the mouth of Satan:

> To Him / Glory and praise whose wisdom had ordained . . .
> Instead / Of Spirits malign, a better Race to bring
> Into their vacant room, and thence diffuse
> His good to worlds and ages infinite . . .[94]
> [Satan speaking of God] He, to be avenged,
> And to repair his numbers thus impaired . . .
> Or to spite us more — / Determined to advance into
> Our room / A creature formed of earth . . . this new
> Favourite / Of Heaven, this . . . son of despite,
> Whom, us the more to spite, his Maker raised . . .[95]
> Lest his [Satan's] heart exalt him . . . I can repair
> That detriment . . . and in a moment will create
> Another world; out of one man a race
> Of men innumerable, there to dwell,
> Not here, till, by degrees of merit raised,
> They open to themselves at length the way
> Up hither, under long obedience tried. . . .[96]

Not infrequently associated with the belief that man was in part created to repair the damage occasioned by the rebel angels, was a conception which emphasized, not the importance of Heaven, but rather that of man. This was the commonplace idea, based upon Genesis 1. 26 ff., and related Scriptural passages, that because of His goodness, God had formed man, had given him a delightful Paradise, and made him governor of a world created especially for him. As Milton wrote:

> In narrow room Nature's whole wealth; yea, more!
> A Heaven on Earth: for blissful Paradise / Of God
> The garden was . . . Man he made, and for him built
> Magnificent this World, and Earth his seat,
> Him Lord pronounced. . . .[97]

[93] Tostatus, XIII, 421. See also II, 7.
[94] P. L., VII, 186 ff. See also II, 830 ff.
[95] P. L., IX, 143 ff.
[96] P. L., VII, 150 ff. See also V, 498 ff.
[97] IV, 207 ff., IX, 152 ff.

In what may be termed the second step in the positive defense of Divine Providence, God frequently was described as having adequately prepared man to withstand temptation. Adam had been created virtuous and right [98] and provided with a freedom of will unaffected by God's foreknowledge of the Fall.[99] Satan would or could not employ violence to overthrow man, only fraud,[100] and against this man was protected both by his reason and by ample warning.[101] It was necessary, and also proper that Adam should obey his creator,[102] particularly since he had received an easy commandment,[103] and this chiefly a pledge of or a just lesson in obedience.[104] To reject this one simple commandment was obviously to be ungrateful, haughty

[98] P. L., III, 98–99. Cf. Eccles. 7. 29; Augustine, Enchiridion. CVII; Bonaventure, II, d. XXIX, ii, 3; Damascene, II, 12; Hugo, Sum. Sent., III, 5 ff.; Peter Lombard, II, XXIV, 1.

[99] P. L., III, 112 ff.; cf. IX, 350 ff. Augustine, City of God, V, 9–10, XIV, 11; De Correptione et Gratia, XI, n. 32; Bonaventure, ibid.; Calvin, p. 144; Cedrenus, p. 13; Damascene, II, 30, De Duabus Voluntatibus, XXVIII; Contra Manicheos, XXXVII; Du Bartas, Imposture, ll. 473 ff.; J. Fletcher, pp. 39 ff.; Goodman, p. 33; Hugo, ibid.; Peter Lombard, II, d. XXIV, iii; Purchas, p. 22; Ralegh, p. 27.

[100] P. L., V, 242–243. Bonaventure, II, d. XXI; Hugo, De Sacramentis, I, vii, 2; Peter Lombard, II, d. XXI, ii; Purchas, p. 21; Tostatus, XIII, 421. St. Bonaventure and Tostatus use the statement which Peter Lombard quoted from Hugo, 'Sed quia illi per violentiam nocere non poterat, ad fraudem se convertit. . . .'

[101] P. L., V, 238 ff., VI, 900 ff.; IX, 350 ff. Cf. Genesis, 3. 3; Calvin, pp. 64, 163; Du Bartas, Imposture, ll. 501 ff.; Grotius. Adam, II, i; Vondel, Adam, II (closing lines). In Paradise Lost, IV, 549 ff., Adam and Eve are (unsuccessfully) protected by Gabriel (the strength of God). Gregory I, Hom. XXXIV in Evang., and St. Bonaventure, Centiloquium, III, 18, described Gabriel as the might of God, who strengthens man. Henry More, Psychozoia, III, 44, referred to the angel as the 'strong youthful Gabriel.' In the epic, the guards of whom he is chief are the 'youth of Heaven.' The Cornish Creation, ed. cit., p. 25, described him as the leading angelic warrior, and Vondel, ibid., made Gabriel commander of the angels who attend and guard the wedding feast of Adam and Eve. Milton's idea that Adam had angelic guardianship in Paradise may be compared to that of St. Thomas, I, 113, 4; and to Peyton, who wrote, I, 65, that God charged the angels to be Adam's 'fence and guard.'

[102] P. L., V, 501 ff.; VIII, 640 ff. Ainsworth, p. 10; Augustine, City of God, XIV, 13; Diodati, p. 1; Vondel, ibid.; Willet, p. 58. Cf. More, Hymn upon the Creation of the World.

[103] P. L., IV, 421, 432–433. Beaumont, VI, 162; Du Bartas, Eden, ll. 481 ff.; Grotius, ibid.; Willet, pp. 33–34.

[104] P. L., III, 94–95. Bonaventure, II, d. XVII, dub. 5; Calvin, p. 126; Du Bartas, ibid., ll. 447 ff.; Gregory I, Moral. XXXV, 29; Mercer, p. 80; Willet, p. 33. I include here the conception that man's sin was not so much the act of eating the apple, as his disobedience in so doing.

and indifferent toward God.[105] These orthodox arguments in proof of the Providence of God and of the guilt of Man, Milton accepted and effectively utilized.

The concluding portion of the composite affirmative defense of Eternal Providence consisted of a group of beliefs both obviously orthodox in nature and common to Christianity in general.[106] From the whole of fallen and lost mankind, God through his grace elected a chosen number,[107] and moved by compassion, Christ died as man in atonement for Adam's sin.[108] Because of God's benignity and foreknowledge, and his tempering of Justice with Mercy, good was born out of evil. As the Roman Church sang in the Exultet, the Fall became the *felix culpa* which brought greater glory to God, and would bring to man a happier paradise than the Garden of Eden:[109]

> [Christ] shall come . . . [and] then the Earth
> Shall be all Paradise, far happier place
> Than this of Eden, and far happier days . . .

[105] P. L., III, 96 ff. Augustine, City of God, XIV, 13; De Gen. ad Lit., XI, v, 7 and xxx, 39; Bonaventure, II, d. XXII, 1, 3, and 2, 3; P. Fletcher, Purple Island, VII, 11; Peter Lombard, II, d. XXII, 1; Willet, p. 49.

[106] The somewhat traditional conception, P. L., III, 129 ff., that since Satan fell self-tempted and self-depraved, and Adam because deceived by Satan, man will find grace, but Satan none, will be found among others in St. Bonaventure, II, d. XXI, and Peter Lombard, II, d. XXI, 7: 'Quare peccatum hominis, et non angeli, remediabile sit.' Quoting Gregory I, Moral., IV, iii, 8, the latter said in part: 'Qui ergo incitatorem habuit ad malum, non injuste reparatorem habuit ad bonum. Diabolus vero, quia sine alicuius tentatione peccavit, per alium, ut surgeret, juvari non debuit nec per se potuit; et ideo irremediabile peccatum eius exstitit. Peccatum vero hominis, sicut per alium habuit initium, ita per alium non incongrue habuit remedium.'

[107] P. L., III, 183 ff., XII, 111 ff., 214, 447 ff. Faithful and Elect seemingly were synonymous terms with Milton. The general doctrine of election is of course amply supported by such Scriptural passages as Romans 8. 28–30 and 2 Peter 1. 10, and prior to and during Milton's age seems to have been embraced by all principal Christian sects. To the believer in Original Sin, it was an optimistic and not a pessimistic doctrine. As Augustine, City of God, XII, 22; Calvin, p. 255; Mersenne, col. 321, and many others stated or unmistakably implied, the doctrine exemplified the goodness and grace of God.

[108] J. Fletcher, pp. 78 ff., and Peyton, I, 130 ff., describe debates between personifications of God's Justice and Mercy which with Fletcher are concluded by Pity's speaking in behalf of man, and with Peyton, by Christ's offering Himself. Milton employs a somewhat similar situation, III, 203 ff., in the scene where Christ acts as a mediator. See also III, 132 and X, 78, for Milton's emphasis upon the Justice and Mercy of God.

[109] So far as I am aware, the commonplaceness of the conception of the Happy Fall

> O Goodness infinite, Goodness immense,
> That all this good of evil shall produce . . .
> Much more than much more good thereof shall spring —
> To God more glory, more good-will to men. . . .[110]

To the positive defense of Divine Providence in the matter of man's fall, it was of course customary to add what may be termed a negative. This defense was in essence the well-known conception, adequately supported by current interpretation of Scripture, that Satan was the first author and instigator of evil. It described at length the Devil's venom against both God and man, the first of whom he hated because of the loss of Heaven and the creation of man to occupy his rooms. Man he hated because destined to take his place, and envied because of his happiness. On occasion it included the minor theme, discussed above, that Satan burned with revenge because God had created man to despite him.[111] So appealing was the negative defense, doubtless in part because of its dramatic possibilities, that if anything it received in literature more space and emphasis than the positive. Milton suggests accurately this situation in the many passages of Paradise Lost devoted, first, to Satan's hatred of God and desire to obtain revenge upon Him through man,[112] and secondly, to Satan's envy of man's present and future state:[113]

---

was first pointed out by Professor Taylor, op. cit., p. 22, where he included it among the 'Commonplaces in Paradise Lost,' and cited it (as again on pp. 45 and 71) as found also in Du Bartas. In a later and independent study, 'Milton and the Paradox of the Fortunate Fall,' ELH, IV (1937), 161–179, Professor Arthur O. Lovejoy demonstrated that the conception was a popular commonplace in Christian literature 'from the Fourth to the Seventeenth Centuries.' To the writers listed by Professor Lovejoy may be added, among others, Mercer, p. 72; Mersenne, col. 321; and Willet, p. 34.

[110] P. L., XII, 458 ff.

[111] An additional related and supporting theme, drawn from John 8. 44, was that Satan was a murderer from the beginning. Cf. Bonaventure, II, d. III, and Mercer, p. 92.

[112] Cf. Andreini, I, ii and iii; Boehme, Regeneration, II, 46; Bonaventure, II, d. V, 1, 1; Caedmon, pp. 25 ff.; Calvin, p. 146; Du Bartas, Imposture, ll. 45 ff.; Grotius, Adam, I, i ff.; Lancetta, II, iii; Pererius, VIII, 28; Peyton, I, 123; Purchas, pp. 21 ff.; Rupertus, De Victoria Verbi Dei, II, 7; Vondel, Adam, I, and Lucifer V (pp. 424 ff.).

[113] Cf. Augustine, City of God, XIV, 11; Boehme, ibid.; Bonaventure, II, d. XXI; Caedmon, p. 23; Old English Hexameron, ll. 449 ff.; P. Fletcher, Purple Island, VII, 11; Heywood, p. 464; Hugo, Sum. Sent., III, 4; Masenius, Sarcotis, pp. 8, 84 ff.; Mersenne, Emendationes, prob. 52; Peter Lombard, II, d. XXI, 1; Peyton, I, 67;

All is not lost — the unconquerable will,
And study of revenge, immortal hate . . .
Satan, now first inflamed with rage, came down . . .
To wreck on innocent frail Man his loss
Of that first battle, and his flight to Hell.[114]

[God] created . . . a place of bliss . . . and therein
Placed / A race of upstart creatures, to
Supply / Perhaps our vacant room . . . behold, instead
Of us, outcast, exiled, his new delight,
Mankind, created, and for him this World!
The Devil . . . with jealous leer malign / Eyed them . . .
Him who next / Provokes my envy, this new
Favourite / Of Heaven, this Man of Clay . . .[115]

A further related belief was that the fallen angels, and necessarily Satan, always carried Hell and its excruciating tortures within them. As St. Thomas wrote, 'although the demons are not actually bound within the fire of hell while they are in this dark atmosphere, nevertheless their punishment is none the less. . . . Hence it is said in a gloss upon Jas. iii, 6: *They carry the fire of hell with them wherever they go.*' [116] In the words of St. Bonaventure, 'Daemones, ubicumque sint, infernali cruciatu, crucientur.' [117]

A character regarded by Christendom as undergoing perpetual torture, as irrevocably confirmed in evil,[118] and filled with hatred and envy of God and man, was expected to show

---

Purchas, p. 21; Swan, p. 496. General references to Satan's envy, malice and pride will be found, among others, in Clarendon, p. 18; Damascene, II, 30; and Rupertus, De Omnipotentia Dei, V.

[114] P. L., I, 106 ff., 661 ff.; IV, 9 ff. Cf. I, 600 ff.; II, 345 ff.

[115] P. L., II, 832 ff.; IV, 105 ff., 502 ff.; IX, 174 ff. Cf. IX, 143 ff.

[116] Sum. Theol., I, 64, 4. An extended list of Roman Catholic writers who held this or similar beliefs may be found in Migne, PL., Index XXXV, De Daemonibus, section 4, De poenis daemonibus illatis (CCXIX, 47–48). Section 2, De daemonum proerogativis lapsu amissis (ibid., 45–46), provides an equally extended list of those who, among other related ideas, set forth the conception that the apostate angels 'in malitia obstinatos esse.'

[117] Sent., II, d. VI, 2, 2. See also the Sentences of Richardus, II, d. VI, 2, 1; of Stephen Brulefer, II, d. VI, 4; Sir Thomas Browne, Religio Medici, Everyman ed., pp. 57–58; Marlowe, Dr. Faustus, III, 80, V, 115 ff.; and the anonymous Discourse of Devils, I, 5 ff. Cf. Thomas Bancroft, Epigrams, London, 1639, II, 15.

[118] In addition to the writers cited in note 83, above, see Boehme, Three Prin., V, 30, and Hugo, Sum. Sentent., II, 4.

his envy, despair, and anger upon viewing either Paradise or the inhabitants for whom it had been created. The devil described by Phineas Fletcher envied Adam and Eve, and was swollen with pride and hate.[119] As he moved toward Paradise, the Antitheus of Masenius appeared cruel and menacing, and displayed the pangs of jealous rage and despair.[120] Such a Satan was the Devil of Du Bartas, as he prepared to tempt Eve:

> While Adam bathes in these felicities,
> Hell's Prince . . . / Feels a . . . busy-swarming nest
> Of never-dying dragons in his breast,
> Sucking his blood . . . / Pinching his entrails . . .
> His cursed soul still most extremely racking . . .
> But above all, Hate, Pride, and envious spite,
> His hellish life do torture day and night . . .
> The Proud desire to have in his subjection
> Mankind enchained in gyves of Sin's infection:
> And the envious heart-break to see yet to shine
> In Adam's face God's image all divine,
> Which he had lost; and that man might achieve
> The glorious bliss, his pride did him deprive . . .
> Spur-on his course, his rage redoubling still . . .
> Doth fire / A hell of furies in his fell desire:
> His envious heart, self-swoln with sullen spite . . .[121]

Of this tradition was the Satan of Milton as he approached and entered Paradise:

> [He] Begins his dire attempt; which, nigh the birth
> Now rowling, boils in his tumultuous breast,
> And like a devilish engine back recoils
> Upon himself. Horror and doubt distract
> His troubled thoughts . . . within him Hell
> He brings . . . nor from Hell . . . can fly / By change
> Of place . . . Now conscience wakes . . . the bitter memory
> Of what he was, what is . . . [Satan's] face
> Thrice changed with pale — ire, envy, and despair . . .
> The Fiend / Saw undelighted all delight . . .
> Two of far nobler shape . . . in their looks divine
> The image of their glorious Maker shon . . .
> O Hell! what do mine eyes with grief behold?
> Into our room of bliss thus high advanced. . . .[122]

[119] Ibid. See also Purchas, p. 21: 'Satan [did] see, disdain and envy them.'

[120] Ibid.

[121] Imposture, ll. 35 ff.

[122] IV, 15 ff., 86 ff., 105 ff., 285 ff., 358 ff.

B

In harmony with an ancient and in his day a respected custom, Milton placed the scene of the temptation and Fall upon the top of a high mountain.[123] More accurately, he located Paradise upon the tops of two radically different mountains, the first of which provided the setting for the initial entry of Satan.[124] The crest of this mountain was 'the champain head of a steep wilderness, whose hairy sides . . . Access denied.' Above the tangled thickets rose 'Cedar, and pine, and fir, and branching palm,' and 'higher than their tops / The verduous wall of Paradise.' Yet higher, stood a 'circling row / Of goodliest trees, loaden with fairest fruit.' [125] As I have suggested elsewhere, this mountain had at least a precedent in Spenser's Faerie Queene.[126] The second hill, and the setting for both the first and second temptations, was the famous Mount Amara: [127] 'a rock of alabaster, piled up to the clouds, / Conspicuous far'; a 'craggy cliff, that overhung, / Still as it rose.' [128] Since Milton had, in keeping with other writers,[129] rejected Amara as the true place of Paradise, and had located the Garden in the accepted region, there was nothing heterodox in making use of physical characteristics ascribed to the Abyssinian mountain.[130]

The internal physical aspects of Milton's Paradise apparently remained unchanged throughout the epic. The picture was in brief the idyllic and romantic amplification of Genesis 2. 8–9,

[123] Hugo, Sum. Sent., III, 4, described it as 'locus eminentissimus'; Vondel, I (p. 270) as a 'lofty mount.'

[124] We have, I believe, ignored the fact that Milton employed two mountains for the locus of Paradise. He may in addition have thought of a third. Cf. V, 260, 'the Garden of God, with cedars crowned above all hills.'

[125] IV, 134 ff. See also the 'shaggy hill' of IV, 224. It was to this mountain top that God led Adam in VIII, 302 ff.

[126] 'Milton's Technique of Source Adaptation,' SP, XXXV (1938), 69 ff.

[127] I shall discuss in a work in preparation the light which use of two distinct mountains may throw upon the growth of Paradise Lost.

[128] IV, 543 ff. See also XI, 118 ff., 376 ff.; XII, 639 ff.

[129] Cf. Tasso, Del Mondo Creato, VII, 759; Peyton, I, 91.

[130] IV, 280 ff. During Milton's era Amara was described in glowing terms by a variety of writers, including Heylyn, IV, 53; Peyton, I, 91 ff.; and Purchas, pp. 743 ff.

common to probably innumerable descriptions of the Garden in Eden.[131] In keeping with the similar and equally traditional expansion of Genesis 1. 27, Milton emphasized the perfection, dignity, and virtue of mankind, particularly the majesty of Adam,[132] and eulogized both nakedness and the simplicity and purity which it represented.[133] He likewise accepted the convention which stressed and reiterated the great beauty of Eve.[134] It is, I regret to say, impractical to illustrate the point by one or more complete analogues, but the extent to which Milton both followed and transcended a tradition well developed by the time of St. Basil will be suggested by comparing pertinent

[131] P. L., IV, 142 ff., 690 ff. See also V, 1 ff.; IX, 426 ff. Cf. Ambrose, De Paradiso, I ff.; Avitus, De Initio Mundi, II, 6 ff.; Basil, De Paradiso, 2, 4 ff.; Beaumont, VI, 143 ff.; Calvin, pp. 115 ff.; Damascene, II, 11; Du Bartas, Eden, esp. 11, 337 ff.; Grotius, Adam, I, 1; Masenius, pp. 9, 84 ff.; Mercer, pp. 47 ff.; Pererius, III, 20 ff.; Peyton, I, 107 ff.; Philo, On the . . . Creation, LIV; Purchas, pp. 14 ff., 21; Ralegh, pp. 32 ff., 49 ff.; Tasso, Del Mondo Creato, VII, 665 ff.; Tostatus, II, 8 ff.; Vondel, Adam, II, and Lucifer, I; Willet, pp. 29 ff., 44. As Milton did later, IV, 268 and IX, 439 ff.; Beaumont, VI, 148, and Peyton I, 110, compared the Garden of Eden with other paradises. Milton, IV, 159 ff., also joined Beaumont in comparing the perfumes of Paradise to the odors of Arabia.

[132] P. L., IV, 288 ff. See also VII, 506 ff., VIII, 57 ff. Cf. Ainsworth, p. 13; Basil ibid., 3; Calvin, p. 137; Cedrenus, p. 11; Du Bartas, VI, 445 ff.; Gregory Nazianzen Orat. XXXVIII, 11 ff.; Mercer, p. 71; Peyton, I, 65 ff.; Philo, ibid., XXI ff.; Purchas p. 21; Swan, p. 496; Vondel, Lucifer, I; Willet, pp. 31, 39.

[133] P. L., IV, 312–318. See also IX, 1114–1115. Cf. Ainsworth, ibid.; Calvin, ibid.; Damascene, De Fide Orth., II, 11; Diodati, p. 5; Mercer, p. 71; Philo, Allegor. Inter. of Gen., I, 15 ff.; Willet, p. 39.

[134] P. L., IV, 492 ff. See also V, 379 ff.; VIII, 470 ff.; IX, 386 ff., 424 ff., 457 ff. Cf. Beaumont, VI, 193 ff., 213 ff. (200 plus lines); Caedmon, pp. 35, 39, 43–44, 51; Du Bartas, VI, 1030 ff.; Peyton, I, 61 ff.; Vondel, ibid. Milton's episode, IX, 457 ff., wherein Satan was temporarily overcome by the beauty of Eve, and at the close pronounced her 'fair, divinely fair, fit love for Gods,' had a partial precedent in the myth that 'angels had loved and coupled with women.' This myth, especially as set forth in I Enoch vi, 4 ff., was widely known during the Seventeenth Century, and among other places was available to Milton in Scaliger's Thesaurus Temporum, pp. 244 ff., in Purchas, p. 31, and Syncellus, pp. 20, 42 ff. A further apparent allusion to the myth occurs in V, 446, where, after reference to Eve ministering to Adam and Raphael naked, Milton wrote 'If ever, then, / Then had the Sons of God excuse to have been / Enamoured at that sight.' He may also have had in mind such a union of the myth with I Cor. 11. 10 as was attacked by Willet, p. 74: 'These sons of God were not the Angels, which some have supposed to have fallen for their intemperance with women . . . as Josephus, Philo, Justin, Clemens Alexandrine, Tertullian, conjectured; who so expounded that place of S. Paul, that women should be covered because of the angels, least they should be tempted with their beauty.'

sections cited from Book IV with the following brief description from Samuel Purchas: [135]

Hitherto we have beheld . . . our first parents, the lively images of the Creator and the creature; whom we have somewhat leisurely viewed in a naked majesty, delighting themselves in the enamelled walks of their delightful garden. The Rivers . . . ran to present their best offices to their new lords. . . . The trees stooped to behold them, offering their shady mantle and variety of fruits, as their natural tribute . . . they enjoyed all mutual comforts in the Creator, the creatures, and in themselves. A blessed pair, who enjoyed all they desired . . . lords of all, and of more than all; content . . . in all they saw, [to] see their Maker's bounty, and . . . that infinite greatness and goodness which they could not but love, reverence, admire and adore. . . . [136]

C

During the early Seventeenth and preceding Centuries, there were few themes with greater imaginative appeal than that of the temptation. It then possessed the four essentials of convincing drama, a concrete setting, a dynamic plot, important and human characters, and above all, universal significance. Because of its great appeal, the theme not only was presented at length, but also was enhanced by addition of a multiplicity of secondary conceptions. These varied conceptions, in keeping with others previously discussed, were normally the creations or amplifications of men primarily theologians, and passed directly or indirectly from them to the poets. Such apparently is the history of the secondary ideas and details employed in the temptation scene of Paradise Lost. Of these secondary themes, some were preliminaries to the temptation proper; others, integral parts of it.[137]

[135] The belief expressed by Milton, IV, 618 ff., that man should labor in Paradise, is set forth by Calvin, p. 125; Du Bartas, Eden, ll. 299 ff.; Mercer, p. 55; and Willet, p. 25. The last voiced a conception implicit in JV, 721 ff., when he stated, p. 33, that in part Adam was assigned to keep the garden 'that being thus occupied in continual beholding of the goodly plants in Paradise, he might thereby be stirred up to acknowledge the goodness and bounty of the Creator.' Adam's discourse to Eve, IV, 660 ff., on the stars and the angels suggests the learned or contemplative Adam described by Calvin, p. 58; Campanella, p. 18; Mercer, p. 55; Pererius, V, 44; Tostatus, II, 23.

[136] Op. cit., p. 21.

[137] Milton appears on occasion to have made some use of the conflicting interpretations of commentators, particularly in his employment of two temptations of Eve, and in having Eve twice warned against Satan and the tree, directly by Adam, and indirectly by Raphael.

Perhaps the first enhancement of the temptation was the idea that Satan chose the serpent for his instrument after careful thought.[138] The serpent was strikingly beautiful,[139] and as in the negative and positive descriptions of Origen and Basil, 'did not walk on his chest or belly,' but 'upright and erect on his feet.' [140] He knew Eve was the weaker and more suscepti-

---

The initial and unsuccessful temptation of Eve apparently occurred on the first day of the creation of Eve and Adam (cf. II, 347 ff.; IV, 287 ff., 420 ff., 623 ff., and especially 776 ff.). This was the day which a majority of writers regarded the most probable, as, for example, Calvin, p. 156, Swan, p. 496; Tostatus, III, 14 (but see XIII, 610–611), Vondel, Adam, IV; Willet, pp. 51, 55. The second temptation occurred precisely a week later, on what appears to have been the eighth day (IX, 63–64). The eighth day was the time approved by Pererius, VI, 184, 189, and, according to Willet, p. 55, by other writers whom he failed to identify. During the first and unsuccessful temptation, IV, 800 ff., Satan took to the observer the form of a toad. Eve dreamed however, V, 55 ff., that 'one shaped and winged like one of those from Heaven by us oft seen,' tempted her with an apple which he had plucked from the tree. This use of an angelic form for the temptation seemingly was not usual, but Milton had some precedent in Caedmon. According to Willet, p. 47, who rejected the idea, it was the opinion of St. Bonaventure that Eve believed a 'good spirit' spoke to her on this occasion. The Eve of Caedmon, whose tempter also held before her an apple which he had plucked from the tree, said concerning him to Adam, p. 41, 'I by his habit see that he is one of the envoys of the Lord.' The Eve of Andreini, Adam, III, i, declared to her husband that she ate the apple in order to carry him to the sky. The Eve of Milton, V, 86 ff., dreamed that she flew 'up to the clouds' with her tempter.

It was the more common opinion among theologians, and doubtless among the laity, that God gave the precept against eating of the fruit to Adam, and that Adam as master of the household, then gave the precept to Eve. This belief, which was sponsored by such men as St. Augustine, De Gen. ad Lit., VIII, 17; Lancetta, Adam and Eve, I, iii, and II, ii; Mercer, p. 74, citing St. Ambrose; Pererius, IV, 142, citing Rupertus, and by Peter Lombard, II, d. XXI, 8, was utilized by Milton in IV, 420 ff. There were however other writers, as Willet, p. 33, who held 'it more probable, that God gave the charge to them both.' Still others, as Bishop Tostatus, XIII, 294, did not decide with finality whether God gave the precept to Adam and Eve together or singly, or to Adam and through him to Eve. In Paradise Lost, Eve informed Adam when he warned her of danger that she had heard the warning given him by Raphael, so that, as she said to him, IX, 275–276, 'by thee informed I learn, / And from the parting Angel overheard.'

[138] P. L., IX, 75 ff.; Calvin, p. 140; Du Bartas, Imposture, ll. 106 ff.; Vondel, Adam, III.

[139] P. L., IX, 498 ff.; Beaumont, VI, 233; Grotius, Adam, IV. The latter wrote in part (Todd, IV, 51): 'oculi ardent duo: / Adrecta cervix surgit, et maculis nitet / Pectus superbis; caerulis picti notis / Sinuantur orbes: tortiles spirae micant / Auri colore.' Cf. Murtola, Creazione del Mondo, XII, 11; Tasso, Gier. Lib., XV, 48.

[140] P. L., IX, 496 ff.; Origen, In Ezech. Hom. I (PG III, 446); Basil, De Paradiso, 7. Among others, the belief of Origen was quoted by Bonaventure, II, d. III, and

ble, and in the representative description of Peter Lombard, 'primum igitur solitariam feminam exploravit.' [141] Finding her alone and unsuspecting,[142] he sought to attract her attention, and approached her with 'blandishments.' [143] These more or less common ornaments, including that of discussion of historically famous serpents,[144] Milton accepted. He was equally faithful to tradition in his description of the temptation itself.

The temptation proper was commonly presented or described as an extended and involved episode. Babington spoke of Eve's 'title-tattle too long with the serpent,' and Cedrenus in part rejected the idea that Adam fell on the day of his creation because of the time required for the seduction of Eve.[145] At the outset, to quote Philo, the woman was seduced by 'wiles and deceptions.' [146] Satan flattered her, stressing particularly her beauty,[147] intrigued her by speaking as a man,[148] employed a persuasive voice,[149] and in keeping with Genesis 3. 5, promised the fruit would make her as Deity. He urged the tyranny and envy of God,[150] declared that he had tasted the fruit, and de-

---

Thomas Aquinas, I, 63, 6. Tostatus, III, 1, quoted the interpretation of Peter Lombard that 'accepit diabolus quoddam genus serpentis, quod erecte incedit, quod Pharias vocant.' Du Bartas, ibid., described the serpent when used by Satan as 'not groveling on the clay.' Willet, p. 47, rejected the belief with the statement, 'neither is it to be supposed with Didymus, Jerome's master, that the serpent, during only this time of tentation, was caused by the spirit to stand upright.'

[141] P. L., IX, 422 ff.; Peter Lombard, II, d. XXI, 1, quoting Hugo, De Sacramentis, I, 7, 3. See also Ainsworth, p. 14; Bonaventure, II, d. XXI; Calvin, p. 145; Grotius, Adam, IV; Heywood, p. 464; Mercer, p. 74; Pererius, VI, 87; Purchas, p. 21; Willet, p. 47.

[142] P. L., 527 ff.; Peyton, I, 73; Willet, p. 37. Willet stressed the point by stating Eve was 'altogether without suspicion.'

[143] P. L., IX, 495 ff.; Beaumont, VI, 237 ff.; Calvin, pp. 149 ff. Milton's 'Oft he [the serpent] bowed his . . . neck, fawning,' is supported by Beaumont's 'Thrice did he bow his flattering neck.'

[144] P. L., IX, 503 ff.; Pererius, VI, 15.

[145] P. L., IX, 529–792. Babington, p. 17; Cedrenus, p. 12. See also Beaumont, VI, 237 ff.; Calvin, pp. 147 ff.; Du Bartas, Imposture, ll. 273 ff.; Grotius, Adam, IV; Willet, pp. 47 ff.

[146] On the . . . Creation, LIX.

[147] P. L., IX, 532 ff.; Beaumont, ibid., Du Bartas, ibid.; Grotius, ibid.; Valmarana, p. 70.

[148] P. L., IX, 553 ff.; Du Bartas, ibid.; Willet, p. 47.

[149] P. L., IX, 670 ff.; Du Bartas, ibid., ll. 211 ff.; Willet, ibid. Both Du Bartas and Milton compare Satan to great or renowned orators.

[150] P. L., IX, 690 ff.; Calvin, ibid.; Du Bartas, ibid., ll. 273 ff.; Grotius, ibid.; Valmarana, ibid.

scribed the enlightenment and exaltation which followed.[151] As is implied in Genesis 3. 6, the fruit itself was rarely attractive, and 'gave longing to the palate.'[152] Tempted both by Satan and the fragrant apple, Eve succumbed, and, in the words of Milton, 'greedily . . . ingorged without restraint.'[153]

When Milton turned to the fatal temptation of Adam he again selected what had been the major ideas of a traditional pattern.[154] Eve advanced the 'false persuasions' of Satan;[155] Adam considered them quite seriously,[156] but the decisive force

[151] P. L., IX, 591 ff.; Beaumont, VI, 247.

[152] P. L., IX, 740 ff. Swan, as quoted, p. 496. Cf. Du Bartas, ibid., ll. 349–350; Philo, ibid., LV; Willet, p. 48.

[153] P. L., IX, 791. Caedmon, p. 57, described God as saying to Eve, 'thou in that apple erst thyself didst gorge.' See also Hugo, Sum. Sent., III, 5. Milton's device of emphasizing the seriousness of Eve's transgression by describing nature as reacting to it, employed in IX, 782 ff. (repeated when Adam fell), had previously been used by Beaumont, VI, 254. Grotius, Adam, V, ii, utilized it to intensify Adam's error in proposing to disobey God a second time by offering to die with Eve. Professor Taylor, p. 105, finds a suggestion of the device in Du Bartas' lines, 'For the earth feeling (even in her) the effect / Of the doom thundered 'gainst thy foul defect.' See also Boehme, Three Prin., XV, 26.

[154] I have as yet not found what may be called a traditional pattern for the thoughts and behaviour of Eve immediately following her fall. The exhilarating effect of the fruit, described by Milton, IX, 792 ff., had however been mentioned by Valmarana, p. 73, and Peyton, I, 79, discussed the rabbinical legend that it was an intoxicating wine. The conception, IX, 823 ff., that eating the apple would make Eve equal or superior to Adam is implicitly in Caedmon, p. 36, and perhaps in Tostatus, XIII, 756. Both Mercer, p. 79, and Willet, p. 50, spoke of the rabbinical legend, included by Milton, IX, 828 ff., that Eve tempted Adam lest she die and Adam marry another woman. Beaumont, VI, 259, wrote that Eve 'played . . . the Serpent,' because she desired Adam to share her misery; Willet, p. 50, to share her happiness; and Tostatus concluded, III, 10, that she principally was motivated by 'inordinate love' for her husband — all of which themes are used, and the last stressed by Milton, IX, 830 ff. Having reached her decision, the poet's Eve then brought to Adam, IX, 851, 'a bough of fairest fruit,' a charming expansion of Scripture both comparable and superior to the plurality of 'beauteous apples' of Beaumont's temptress, VI, 259, and the 'some' which Caedmon's Eve, p. 40, carried 'in her hands' and 'in her bosom.' In Rubens' painting, 'Eve Offering Adam the Forbidden Fruit,' Eve is shown receiving from the serpent a branch of apples. We also may compare IX, 892 ff. with Peyton, I, 72. As I shall attempt to suggest in 'Milton and Moses Bar-Cepha,' an extended number of analogues for the temptation scene and other sections of Paradise Lost occur in the work of the Syrian Bishop. Moses Bar-Cepha said in part that Eve ate the forbidden fruit before calling Adam, to the end that she might excel and rule him. When both had partaken of the fruit, they 'turned toward lechery . . . were made intoxicated . . . [and] were followers of wanton lust.'

[155] P. L., IX, 863 ff.

[156] P. L., IX, 926 ff.

was the 'female charm' of Eve.[157] Milton's presentation of the second idea may be called a literary expression of the interpretation that Adam was to an important degree 'seduced by the same . . . false persuasions whereby the woman was first beguiled, being carried away with an ambitious desire, in knowledge, not to be equalized, but made like unto God.' [158] The poet's evaluation of the first and last of the three ideas was, in the words of Calvin, that 'Eve entangled Adam with the same fallacies by which she was deceived . . . [but] the opinion has commonly been received that he was rather captivated by her allurements than persuaded by Satan's impostures.' [159]

D

In his Demonomachiae, Valmarana related that as soon as Adam tasted the apple (pomum), 'simul oscula libat uxori: per membra calor non cogitur ante fervet.' [160] Similarly, the Adam of Milton was at once inflamed by 'carnal desire,' and 'on Eve began to cast lascivious eyes . . . in lust they burn.' [161] In these lines both writers gave dramatic expression to the ancient and widely accepted belief that carnal lust was a consequence of the Fall.[162] Equally conventional was the conception, to quote Philo, that 'Reason is henceforth ensnared and . . . becomes a slave.' [163] Further traditional results of the Fall and of God's subsequent condemnation of man were intense sorrow on the part of Adam and Eve,[164] loss of desire to live or contemplation

[157] P. L., IX, 960 ff. The traditional interpretation, summed up by Milton, IX, 998–999, that Adam was 'not deceived, but fondly overcome by female charm,' apparently was dictated by the necessity of providing an explanation of Adam's fall in harmony with 1 Tim. 2. 14: 'Adam was not beguiled, but the woman.'

[158] Willet, p. 48.

[159] Op. cit., p. 152. Beaumont, VI, 260; Grotius, Adam, IV; Mercer, p. 80; Pererius, VI, 89, 93 ff.; Tostatus, III, 10; Willet, pp. 48 ff. Du Bartas, Imposture, ll. 351 ff., and Peyton, I, 114–115, stressed the point that Adam was enticed by Eve. The tempter in Caedmon, p. 36, urged Eve to repeat his arguments to Adam.

[160] Op. cit., p. 85.

[161] P. L., IX, 1013 ff.

[162] Cf. Augustine, City of God, XIII, 3; Bonaventure, II, d. XX; P. Fletcher, Purple Island, VII, 11; Old English Hexameron, ll. 465 ff.; Peter Lombard, II, d. XX, 1; Purchas, p. 22; Tostatus, XIII, 770 ff.; Willet, pp. 58 ff.

[163] On the . . . Creation, LIX; P. L., IX, 1127 ff.; Calvin, p. 127; Purchas, and Willet, ibid.

[164] P. L., IX, 1090 ff., X, 720 ff.; Caedmon, pp. 47 ff.; Vondel, Lucifer, V. The

of suicide,[165] heated quarrels, and self-recrimination.[166] Descriptions of the quarrelling and self-recrimination of Adam and Eve were not uncommon in literary treatments of the Fall,[167] but it probably was less literary influence and more that of commentaries and compendiums which made and kept such disputes traditional. In the latter works, quoting St. Bonaventure, one of the most mooted questions occasioned by the Fall was, 'An vir gravius peccaverit, quam mulier?' [168] In discussions of this question both Adam and Eve were 'indicted' on a varying number of 'counts,' four each with Bonaventure, but with Willet, four against Adam and three against Eve.[169] The representative conclusion appears that set forth by the Saint, who found Eve had transgressed more in the *sinning*; Adam, more in the *sin*. The principal charge against the first was the fault which Milton's contrite Eve confessed to her husband: 'Thou [hast sinned] against God only; I against God and thee.' [170] Similarly, the gravest indictment against Adam — one based upon Romans 5. 12 — was that which Milton's Adam emphasized: 'Endless misery from this day onward . . . to perpetuity . . . all mankind, for one man's fault . . . condemned.' [171] In harmony with Genesis 3. 13 and 1 Timothy 2. 14, the point frequently was stressed that Eve had been deceived.[172]

---

idea of Adam and Eve praying, P. L., X, 1098 ff., occurs in Caedmon, p. 48. Milton's hyperbole, ibid., of their tears 'watering the ground,' is supported by Du Bartas' figure, Imposture, ll. 632–633, of the 'rivers gushing down the eyes of our first parents.'

[165] P. L., X, 852 ff., 1000 ff.; Andreini, IV, v; Grotius, Adam, V, ii; Vondel, Adam, V. Milton and Vondel joined Caedmon, pp. 51 ff., in describing Eve as at last comforting Adam, and the two becoming reconciled.

[166] P. L., IX, 1122 ff. The condemnation of Adam because he permitted Eve to rule him, addressed by Milton's Adam to himself, IX, 1182 ff., is in Vondel, Adam, V, uttered by Eve to him.

[167] Caedmon, pp. 49 ff.; Vondel, Adam, V, i, ii.

[168] II, d. XXII, 1, 3. See also Babington, pp. 17 ff.; Brulefer, II, d. XXII, 3; Calvin, pp. 152 ff.; Hugo, Sum. Sent., III, 6, and De Sacram. I, vii, 10; Pererius, VI, 87 ff.; Peter Lombard, II, d. XXII, 4; Richardus, II, d. XXII, 3; Ægidius Romanus (Egidio Colonna), II, d. XXII, 1, 3; Thomas Aquinas, II–II, 163, 4, and Sent. II, d. XXII, 1, 3; Tostatus, III, 5 ff.; Willet, p. 49; Wolleb-Ross, pp. 74–75.

[169] Ibid.

[170] P. L., X, 930–931.

[171] P. L., X, 810 ff. In addition to the writers cited in note 168, Du Bartas, Imposture, ll. 549 ff., stressed this point. See also Bonaventure, II, d. XX, 3, 3.

[172] Cf. P. L., IX, 404, 'O much deceived, much failing, hapless Eve.' In addition to the writers cited note 168, see Caedmon, pp. 41 ff., who believed with Babington that in giving the apple to Adam, 'Eve meant him no harm.'

The orthodox nature of Milton's conception that subsequent to the Fall God called Sin and Death from Hell to waste the earth is adequately attested by the employment of a basically similar idea in a work which ran more than two hundred editions in a half-century — the Divine Weekes of Du Bartas.[173] There was in addition some literary support for the congratulatory meeting of devils held following the successful temptation of man.[174] The transformation of Satan and his exulting cohorts into spitting snakes represented rare inventive genius, but the many descriptions which portray Hell as filled with serpents indicate that Milton attempted here no fundamental departure from tradition.[175] In view of the important associations that clustered about the forbidden fruit, it was both in point and artistically effective for Milton's Satan to place in dramatic relief the instrument by which he had conquered:

> Man . . . by fraud I have seduced / From his
> Creator, and, the more to increase
> Your wonder, with an apple![176]

A half-century earlier the Lucifer of Valmarana had announced:

> Ne roseas, Asote, genas, ne lumina linquas,
> Hae tibi erunt arces, haec arma et machina belli.
> Ipsi ego succedam pomo.[177]

[173] P. L., X, 618 ff., esp. 628; Furies, ll. 237 ff. Milton's 'wasteful furies' built a bridge from Hell to the world; those of Du Bartas advanced over one. Milton's conceptions, X, 650 ff., XI, 466 ff., that the Fall brought into the world inclement weather, hunger and thirst, bloodshed for man and beast, and death in its 'thousand forms' represent a development of Genesis 3. 17 ff., and related Scriptural passages. From one to all of these themes will be found however among many other writers, including Caedmon, p. 50; Damascene, III, 1; Du Bartas, ibid. (who is especially close to Milton); Gregory Nazianzen, Orat. XXXVIII, 13; Mercer, pp. 96 ff.; Old English Hexameron, ll. 460 ff.; Peyton, I, 73, 77; Purchas, p. 22; Willet, pp. 18, 35 ff.

[174] P. L., X, 441 ff. Cf. Valmarana, p. 79; Vondel, Adam, V, i.

[175] P. L., X, 507 ff. Cf. Beaumont, XIV, 40; Cowley, p. 247; P. Fletcher, Christ's Triumph Over Death, 22; Heywood, p. 347; Crashaw-Marini, 38; Tasso, Gier. Lib., IV, 4 ff. Fletcher, Purple Island, VII, 11, wrote that Adam and Eve listened to a snake, and turned into snakes. That Milton should have introduced here a catalogue of serpents may now appear questionable, but his earlier contemporary, Joseph Beaumont, XV, 271, had employed this device to ornament his description of Hell.

[176] P. L., X, 483 ff.

[177] Demonomachiae, p. 79.

III

There remain for discussion a variety of themes and interpretations set forth in Paradise Lost, Books IV and V, VII and VIII (originally Book VII), and in Books XI and XII (originally Book X).[178] Of these several books, all but the first consist primarily of discussion with an angel, and of direct and indirect angelic revelation. In assigning to angels the function of instructing Adam, and of conveying to him the decrees of God, Milton was of course in harmony with a widely respected and well-established tradition.[179] According to the representative statement of Thomas Heywood, angels were employed by God to deliver messages to men, and 'Archangels are ambassadors, great matters to declare.' [180] In the Adamus Exsul of Grotius, an angel informed Adam regarding cosmology and the wonders of the universe, of angelic life in Heaven, and of man's conduct on earth.[181] The earlier Cedrenus, following I Enoch, Syncellus, and probably other sources, said that the Archangel Uriel instructed Adam concerning a variety of topics, including the Incarnation, the Flood, and the heavens.[182] In the

[178] I omit discussion of the physical characteristics of Milton's Hell, described by him I, 210 ff., as the burning lake of fire and sulphur of Rev. 20. 10, and ornamented with details from Classical, Patristic, and contemporary sources. Cf. Ariosto, Orl. Fur., XXXIV, 5; Caedmon, pp. 3 ff., passim; Cowley, p. 246; I Enoch, xviii, 5 ff., xxi, 1 ff.; J. Fletcher, p. 65; Heywood, p. 346, pp. 386 ff., p. 397; Hugo, De Sacramentis, II, xvi, 4 ff.; Tasso, Gier. Lib., IV, 9, IX, 64; Valmarana, pp. 25, 41; Valvasone, III, 1 ff. See also Marjorie H. Nicolson, 'Milton's Hell and the Phlegraean Fields,' University of Toronto Quarterly, VII (1938), 500–513. The celebrated figure of *darkness visible* (I, 62–63: 'yet from those flames no light; but rather darkness visible'), expresses the conception of the fire of Hell set forth by St. Basil, In Psal. 33, as a dark fire that has lost brightness, by Gregory I, Moral. IX, 46, as a fire which burns but gives no light, and by Heywood, p. 397, as one which gives 'no lustre at all.' In addition, 'the fire of Hell . . . doth always burn, but neither wasteth itself, nor that which it burneth.'

[179] The general supporting tradition was of course based on such Scriptural passages as Ps. 91 [90], 11, 'For he will give his angels charge over thee, / To keep thee in all thy ways,' and Hebrews 1. 14; 2 [4] Esdras, 4 1 ff.; Tobit, chs. 3 ff.; Daniel 10. 5 ff.

[180] Op. cit., pp. 194, 220. See also Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite, De Coelesti (Angelica) Hierarchia, and Gregory I, Hom. 34 in Evang., especially 9 ff.; St. Thomas, I, qq. 111 ff.

[181] Act II.

[182] Op. cit., p. 17; see also p. 21. Cf. Syncellus, pp. 18, 60; I Enoch, xxxiii, 2 ff.; lxxii, 1 ff. In I Enoch, xxxii, 5 ff., the angel Raphael showed Enoch the tree of knowl-

Demonomachiae of Valmarana, Michael related to the recently fallen Adam much the same history which in Paradise Lost, XI–XII, either is revealed by this angel or envisioned in his presence.[183] The Michael of Andreini prophesied to Eve in the closing scenes of L'Adamo.[184] Andrew Willet joined Pererius in questioning the belief, but repeated with him that 'some think . . . Adam and the woman were not ignorant of the fall of the angels, as Catharinus upon this place [Genesis 1. 28].'[185] 'Because Adam yet lacked experience,' wrote Campanella, 'all learning was poured into him.'[186]

A

In Paradise Lost, the pouring of knowledge into Adam was fittingly begun by Raphael, 'the sociable spirit,' who at the command of God talked with Adam 'as friend with friend.'[187] The ensuing conversation, one so extended that it covers virtually one-third of the entire epic, was prefaced by the hospitable reception of Raphael and his entertainment at dinner:

> Some great behest [said Adam to Eve] . . .
> To us perhaps he brings, and will voutsafe
> This day to be our guest. But go with speed
> And what thy stores contain bring forth . . .
> She turns, on hospitable thoughts intent . . .
> She gathers, tribute large, and on the board
> Heaps with unsparing hand. . . . So down they sat
> And to their viands fell. . . . Meanwhile at table Eve
> Ministered naked, and their flowing cups
> With pleasant liquors crowned. . . .[188]

---

edge, and informed him of the sin of his parents in eating its fruit. Gabriel, xx, 7, had charge of Paradise, and Michael, lxxi, 2 ff., disclosed to Enoch 'all the secrets of the ends of Heaven.'

[183] Op. cit., Books IV ff.

[184] L'Adamo, V, ix.

[185] Willet, p. 37; Pererius, V, 35.

[186] Defense of Galileo, tr. Grant McColley, Smith College Studies in History, XXII, p. 18. See also Calvin, pp. 58, 162; Diodati, p. 1; Pererius, ibid. and ff., passim; Tostatus, II, 23.

[187] The attitude of Milton's Raphael and Michael toward Adam is in harmony with the orthodox interpretation, based upon Rev. 19. 10; 22. 8–9, and voiced by Willet, p. 194, that 'Angels will not suffer men to worship them.'

[188] V, 311 ff. For a comparison of the views expressed here by Milton and those of Henry More, see Marjorie H. Nicolson, 'The Spirit World of Milton and More,' SP, XXII (1925), 440 ff.

The spirit of this passage is that of numerous descriptions of Abraham's entertainment of the three angels.[189] In keeping with such descriptions, Milton's account 'presents a beautiful picture of domestic government,' and is both a 'commendation of' and 'a lesson in hospitality.' [190] That the angelic guests of Abraham had for the time actual bodies and ate actual food, was among others the belief of Calvin, of the Roman Bishop Tostatus, and of the Anglican divine Andrew Willet.[191] 'These angels,' said Willet with Calvin, 'as they were endued with true bodies for the time, so they did verily eat, as they did walk and speak, and do other actions of the body.'

As Milton doubtless had consciously planned, the eating together of Raphael and Adam provided an opportunity to present a somewhat complicated chain of argument, one more conveniently discussed in reverse order. The dual objective of this chain, if we may trust the poet's concluding statement, was first to point out to the *then unfallen and immortal* Adam his glorious prospects, and secondly to emphasize the necessity of obedience to God, if these prospects were to be realized:

> Wonder not then, what God for you saw good
> If I [Raphael] refuse not, but convert, as you,
> To proper substance. Time may come when Men
> With Angels may participate, and find
> No inconvenient diet, nor too light fare;
> And from these corporal nutriments, perhaps,
> Your bodies may at last turn all to spirit,
> Improved by tract of time, and winged ascend
> Ethereal, as we, or may at choice
> Here or in heavenly paradises dwell,
> If ye be found obedient. . . .[192]

[189] Cf. Genesis, 18. 2 ff. See also the feast in Vondel, Adam, Act II.

[190] Calvin, p. 471; Willet, p. 206; Mercer, pp. 333–334. See also Du Bartas, Vocation, ll. 1117 ff. Further similarities between Genesis 18 and Milton's account are the failure of Sarah and Eve to eat with the guests, and their overhearing the messages delivered by the angels, Sarah in her tent, and Eve, VIII, 41, 'where she sat retired in sight.'

[191] Calvin, p. 472; Tostatus, XVIII; Willet, p. 199. See also Du Bartas, ibid., 1106 ff.; Mercer, p. 331; Peter Lombard, II, d. VIII, 1; Rupertus, De Glorif. Trin., III, 21; and Augustine, City of God, XV, 23, where the Bishop of Hippo stated: 'Scripture testifies that angels have appeared to men as could not only be seen, but also touched.'

[192] P. L., V, 491 ff.

Milton's emphasis upon the necessity of obedience to God, the major objective of his entire argument, was of course the height of orthodoxy. As the discussion in Section II, A, has indicated, it was a traditional belief that man, *unfallen and immortal*, would gradually ascend or improve in status. To those who accepted this belief, there could be little of the heterodox in the related conception that the hypothetical unfallen Adam would have required food during his gradual ascent. In any event, Milton was no more unorthodox than St. Augustine and Peter Lombard:

> Caro Adae ante peccatum ita immortalis creata est, ut per alimoniam adjuta, esset mortis et doloris expers. Sic igitur immortalis et incorruptibilis condita est caro hominis, ut suam immortalitatem et incorruptionem per observantiam mandatorum Dei custodiret. In quibus mandatis hoc continebatur, ut de illis lignis concessis manducaret, et ab interdicto abstineret; per horum edulium immortalitatis dona conservaret, donec corporalibus incrementis perductus ad aetatem, quae Conditori placeret, multiplicata progenie, ipso jubente, sumeret de ligno vitae, quo perfecte immortalis factus, cibi alimenta non ulterius requireret. . . .[193]
>
> [Peter Lombard] Ecce his verbis videtur Augustinus tradere, quod caro primi hominis immortalitatem in se habuerit, quae per alimoniam ciborum conservaretur usque ad tempus suae translationis in melius, quando de ligno vitae comederet et fieret omnino immortalis, ita ut non posset mori. . . . Sed si [Adam] perstitisset, immortalitatis perfectio esset ei de ligno vitae.[194]

Milton's argument that Adam's body may in time turn all to spirit rests on the conception that man, unfallen and immortal, differed from angels in degree but not in kind. Stated differently, both man and angel had bodies similar in basic substance, but different in the extent to which this substance was refined. Supporting this conception was the doctrine that in the beginning God had created one first matter, and by giving it different forms and degrees of refinement, had produced all things, including angels.

These inter-related conceptions, at times regarded by Miltonic scholarship as heretical, and as stamping Milton as a materialist, probably were not regarded by the poet as heterodox.[195]

[193] Augustine, De Gen. ad Lit., III, xxi, 33, as paraphrased by Peter, II, d. XIX, 6.

[194] Peter Lombard, II, d. XIX, 6. See also cap. 1, where he used the expression 'de transitu ad superiorem.'

[195] The most recent expression of this interpretation is that of E. M. W. Tillyard, The Miltonic Setting, London, 1938, p. 73.

They had indeed not been so considered by Origen, by St. Bonaventure, and by the author of a tractate assigned by Bonaventure and his age to St. Augustine. According to Origen:

> Corporeal being . . . admits of diversity and variety of change, so that it is capable of undergoing all possible transformations, as, *e.g.*, the conversion of wood into fire. . . . Whatever we take as food, is converted into the substance of our body. . . . This [universal] matter . . . possesses such properties as to enable it to be sufficient for all the bodies in the world which God willed to exist. . . . As we have remarked above, therefore, that material substance of the world, possessing a nature admitting of all possible transformations, is, when dragged down to beings of a lower order, moulded into the crasser and more solid . . . but when it becomes the servant of more perfect and more blessed beings, it shines in the splendor of celestial bodies, and adorns either the angels of God or the sons of the resurrection with the clothing of a spiritual body.[196]

In discussing the question, 'An materia ex qua compositi sunt angeli, sit eadem cum materia corporalium,' St. Bonaventure wrote, 'videtur auctoritate Augustini, *de mirabilibus sacrae Scripturae*: "Omnipotens Deus ex informi materia, quam ipse prius de nihilo condidit, cunctarum [visibilium et invisibilium] rerum, hoc est [,] sensibilium et insensibilium, intellectualium et intellectu carentium, species multiformes divisit."[197] Quid hoc expressius?'[198] The conclusion of Bonaventure at the least left the question an open one:

> Secundum varias considerationes, materia recte dicitur quod angelorum et corporum eadem sit, et non sit; profundius tamen illam considerantes, et nobilius, ut metaphysici, eamdem omnium esse judicaverunt. . . . Concedendae ergo sunt rationes probantes eamden esse materiam per essentiam in spiritualibus et corporalibus, sicut manifeste innuit Augustinus in libro *de mirabilibus sacrae Scripturae*, qui fuit altissimus metaphysicus.[199]

B

In view of the studies of Professors Robbins, Thibaut, Taylor, and Williams,[200] it is unnecessary to point out that Milton's description of the Creation generally follows an extremely

[196] Origen, De Principiis (Peri Archon), II, i, 4; ii, 2.

[197] ?Augustine, De Mirab. S. Script., I, 1. This work will be found in the Benedictine edition of the Opera, III, appendix, and in the reprint by Migne, ibid. (PL 35, 2151).

[198] Bonaventure, II, d. III, part i, art. 1, q. 2.

[199] Ibid.

[200] As cited above, notes 2 and 3.

popular tradition, and for the most part is composed of conventional ideas and descriptions. I may pause however to discuss briefly some few of the poet's conceptions, the first of which occurs in the section whose final six lines M. Saurat considered 'the most important passage in Paradise Lost from the philosophical point of view as well as the most characteristic':[201]

> And thou, my Word . . . ride forth, and bid the Deep
> Within appointed bounds be heaven and earth.
> Boundless the Deep, because I am who fill
> Infinitude; nor vacuous the space,
> Though I, uncircumscribed, myself retire,
> And put not forth my goodness, which is free
> To act or not. Necessity and Chance
> Approach not me, and what I will is fate.[202]

The conceptions that God set apart a portion of Chaos for the mundane universe, and that the chaos which surrounded it remained unbounded, represent little more than paraphrases of Proverbs 8. 27 and Job 26. 10: 'He set a circle [King James Version, compass] upon the face of the deep'; 'He hath described a boundary upon the face of the waters, unto the confines of light and darkness.'[203] The remaining major conceptions are those which religious writers delighted in stressing, in particular the ideas that God is uncircumscribed, unlimited and infinite,[204] and that it is He who is omnipresent and fills all

[201] Milton, Man and Thinker, New York, 1925, p. 288.

[202] P. L., VII, 163 ff. We may compare Milton's statement that what God wills is fate, with St. Thomas, I, 116, 2: 'The Divine power or will can be called fate, as being the cause of fate.'

[203] A brief discussion of the poet's idea of God (or Christ) as the Architect who marked out the universe will be found in 'Milton's Golden Compasses,' Notes and Queries, Feb. 11, 1939. Similar and representative contemporary conceptions occur in Du Bartas, I, 226; Goodman, p. 16; More, Psychathanasia, I, i, 24; Swan, p. 39; and Tasso, Del Mondo Creato, I, 276 ff. Tasso describes God, the divine Architect, as bounding the infinite abyss. Job's conception that God separated light and darkness apparently contributed to Milton's description II, 1038 ff., of Chaos beginning 'to retire' as Satan approached the outside shell of the mundane universe and empyreal heaven.

[204] Augustine, City of God, XI, 5; Damascene, I, 8, 13; Du Bartas, I, 363 ff.; Heywood, pp. 29, 211; More, Democritus Platonissans, sts. 34 ff., 45 ff.; Newton, Principia, III, General Scholium; Ralegh, p. 4; Tostatus, Exodus, VII, 14; Wolleb-Ross, pp. 17–18.

space.[205] Damascene reiterated the point that God is uncircumscribed, Heywood declared in part that 'Himself without place, God instated all things'; and Wolleb-Ross wrote that 'God is neither circumscribed, nor defined by place; nor included within it, nor excluded without it.' To More, the wide and endless stretch of chaos lay 'ever equal with the Deity,' and God existed everywhere, unbounded and infinite. Equally attractive to Christians of all creeds and ages were the related ideas, one stated, the other implied in Milton's passage, that God's goodness is free or not affected by necessity, and that He created the world because of his goodness.[206]

Less important but equally interesting to hexaemeral writers were the questions as to the season of the year when God created the world,[207] what God did in his 'holy rest' prior to creation, and why he 'builded so late in chaos.' [208] Milton followed tradition in raising and answering the second and third; the first he did not discuss, but accepted without comment the apparently more popular opinion that the time of creation was the spring.[209] As we should expect, he employed the cherished figure which described the Holy Spirit which brooded upon the abyss as some kind of fowl.[210] Diodati compared it to a bird; Du Bartas to a hen; and Mercer to both a brooding hen and an eagle. Milton's choice of the dove, perhaps in part suggested by Matthew 3. 16, or a conventional interpretation of the verse, is, I believe, the happiest.

A further tradition of hexaemeral and related literature was

[205] Augustine, ibid.; Du Bartas, Vocation, ll. 1096 ff.; Heywood, ibid., More, ibid., Psychozoia, III, 35n, Antimonopsychia, st. 21; Newton, ibid., Ralegh, pp. 1, 16. See also Robbins, p. 74.

[206] Babington, p. 4; Damascene, II, 29; Mersenne, col. 319; Syncellus, p. 1; Wolleb-Ross, p. 20. As Professor Taylor has noted, p. 16, n. 2, F. E. Robbins, pp. 4, 5, 30, 38, 53, 73–74, 'cites sixteen writers, beginning with Philo Judaeus, *ca.* A.D. 40, and ending with St. Augustine,' who described God's goodness as the cause of the creation.

[207] Cf. Heywood, p. 119; Swan, p. 32; Syncellus, p. 1.

[208] Cf. Augustine, City of God, XI, 6; Calvin, p. 61; Du Bartas, I, 43 ff.; Mersenne, col. 280; Ralegh, p. 19; Willet, p. 22. See also Robbins, pp. 53, 66.

[209] P. L., VII, 90 ff.; IV, 268; V, 394–395.

[210] P. L., I, 19 ff.; VII, 235 ff. Basil, Hom. II in Hexaem.; Diodati, p. 3; Du Bartas, I, 323 ff.; Mercer, p. 11; Swan, p. 43. See also Robbins, p. 39, for use of the figure by Abelard, Ambrose, Augustine, and others.

to define the proper employment of astronomy, and to comment upon various cosmological theories. Among conservatives, the Sun and stars were believed to exist to fulfill the functions ascribed to them in Genesis 1. 14, 16: 'Let there be lights . . . for signs and for seasons, and for days and years. . . . And God made the two great lights, the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night.' [211] To these functions of the heavenly bodies frequently was added, as in the Wolleb-Ross compendium, that of imparting their virtue to inferior globes.[212] These are the functions which Milton accepted:

> Heaven is . . . before thee set, wherein to . . . learn
> His seasons, hours, or days, or months, or years;
> This to attain, whether Heaven move or Earth,
> Imports not, if thou reckon right . . .
> Terrestrial Heaven, danced about by other Heavens . . .
> In thee concentring all their precious beams
> Of sacred influence.[213]

Comment upon cosmological theory, at times brief, and on occasion extended, often included either censure of the doctrine of a plurality of worlds,[214] attack upon the hypothesis of the motion of the earth,[215] or upon both.[216] Du Bartas challenged the theory of the diurnal (axial) rotation of the earth, the original Copernican hypothesis of the earth's triple motion, and the doctrine of a plurality of worlds.[217] These three conceptions are those so effectively described and questioned by Milton.[218] The

[211] As in Augustine, City of God, XII, 15.

[212] Ed. cit., p. 50. See also Willet, p. 11, who cites and follows Junius and Mercer.

[213] P. L., VIII, 66 ff.; IX, 104 ff. See also IV, 667 ff.

[214] Ambrose, Hexaem., I, 1 (3); Augustine, City of God, XI, 5; XII, 11; Calvin, pp. 61–62; Heywood, pp. 141, 147; Valmarana, pp. 242, 346.

[215] Goodman, p. 30; Pererius, I, i, 1 (54); Tostatus, I, 4.

[216] Mersenne, coll. 280, 895 ff., 1082 ff.; Purchas, pp. 7, 10, 12; Swan, pp. 114, 204 ff.

[217] Op. cit., I, 335 ff.; IV, 144 ff., 171 ff. Du Bartas attacks the Democritian doctrine of a plurality of worlds; Milton, phases of the general doctrine which became especially prominent following the celestial telescope.

[218] P. L., VIII, 16 ff. The astronomical background of the Raphael-Adam dialogue on 'celestial motions,' the scientific-religious controversy which it epitomized, and the immediate sources employed by Milton in its composition, are discussed in detail in 'The Astronomy of Paradise Lost,' Studies in Philology, XXXIV (1937), 209–247; 'The Ross-Wilkins Controversy,' Annals of Science, III (1938), 153–189; and 'Milton's Dialogue on Astronomy: The Principal Immediate Sources,' PMLA, LII (1937),

conventional and ancient attack upon cosmological theory and investigation was three-fold: its conclusions were uncertain and fantastic; its hypotheses conflicted with Scripture, the final judge of all truth; and the investigations themselves absorbed time properly belonging to things more worthwhile. Milton sums up this tradition with rare virtuosity:

> From man or angel the great Architect
> Did wisely to conceal, and not divulge
> His secrets . . . Or, if they list to try
> Conjecture, he his fabric of the heavens
> Hath left to their disputes — perhaps to move
> His laughter at their quaint opinions wide . . .
> God, to remove his ways from human sense,
> Placed Heaven from Earth so far, that earthly sight,
> If it presume, might err in things too high,
> And no advantage gain. . . . Be lowly wise . . .
> Contented that thus far hath been revealed
> Not of Earth only, but of highest Heaven . . .
> What is more [than daily life] is fume,
> Or emptiness, or fond impertinence.[219]

C

In commentaries upon Genesis and in related works, there were few themes more popular than those of marriage and the relations of man and woman. As might be expected, these works praised Christian marriage,[220] and in their discussion of the command 'Increase and multiply' of Genesis 1. 18, commented at varying length upon the relations of man and woman. Among Protestants it was, as with Calvin, not uncommon to defend somewhat vehemently the 'chaste use of the lawful and pure ordinance of God,' or with Willet, to speak emphatically against the 'popish inhibition of marriage.' [221] Satan was held up as a foe of matrimony, in part because he desired both to

---

728–762. See also Marjorie H. Nicolson, 'Milton and the Telescope,' English Literary History, II (1935), 1–32.

[219] P. L., VIII, 72 ff. In his assertion that God concealed or withheld from angels knowledge of natural phenomena, Milton ran counter to the conventional interpretation. Cf. Heywood, p. 441, and Thomas Aquinas, I, 57, 1 ff.

[220] Cf. Bonaventure, IV, dd. XXVI ff.; Calvin, p. 134; Goodman, p. 255; Mercer, p. 67; Swan, p. 495.

[221] Calvin, p. 134; Willet, p. 21.

increase license and to diminish population.[222] To those who believed man was in part created to replenish the loss occasioned by the revolt of the fallen angels, it was a logical deduction that Satan would vigorously oppose the multiplication of humanity. The cohabitation of man and woman, as the lines of the conservative Du Bartas suggest, was commonly regarded as serving three desirable ends: 'domestic sweets,' procreation, and the taming of lust: [223]

> Their . . . wedding song . . . Source of all joys . . .
> O blessed bond! O happy marriage . . .
> By thy dear favour, after our decease,
> We leave behind our living images . . .
> By thee, we quench the wild and wanton fires
> That in our soul the Paphian shot inspires.[224]

This interpretation of marriage, together with the remaining themes clustered about it, proved as attractive to Milton as to his predecessors and contemporaries:

> Straight side by side were laid; nor turned, I ween
> Adam from his fair spouse, nor Eve the rites
> Mysterious of connubial love refused:
> Whatever hypocrites austerely talk . . .
> Defaming as impure what God declares
> Pure, and commands to some, leaves free to all.
> Our Maker bids increase; who bids abstain
> But our destroyer, foe to God and Man?
> Hail, wedded Love, mysterious law, true source
> Of human offspring, sole propriety
> In Paradise of all things common else!
> By thee adulterous lust was driven from men
> Among the bestial herds to raunge; by thee
> Founded in reason . . . relations dear . . .
> Perpetual fountain of domestic sweets. . . .[225]

[222] Cf. Calvin, ibid.; Catharinus, I, 18; Pererius, V, 35.

[223] Cf. Bonaventure, ibid.; Damascene, IV, 24; Mercer, p. 60; Willet, pp. 21, 35 ff. The basis of the last end was of course 1 Cor. 7. 2 ff.

[224] Op. cit., VI, 1050 ff.

[225] P. L., IV, 741 ff. It was generally believed that *if* Adam and Eve had cohabited in Paradise, copulation would have been without lust. Cf. Augustine, De Gen. ad Lit., IX, iv, 8; Bonaventure, II, d. XX; Pererius, V, 105; Tostatus, XIII, 770. Under the heading, 'On Copulation in the state of innocence, and at present,' Tostatus said in part that in Paradise concupiscence did not rebel against reason; no venial appetite existed; reason ruled and guided copulation, and cohabitation was only for procreation and never because of concupiscence.' Augustine, City of God, XIV, 23, held that

Perhaps for the reason that the 'rites mysterious' which he here described took place prior to the Fall, Milton's praise of cohabitation was unqualified by the admonitions often found in discussions of marital relations. Man, Calvin had said, should keep his affections in harmony with reason, should live modestly with his wife, and cultivate 'mutual society.' [226] Man and woman, wrote Willet, are not one flesh 'only in respect to copulation, for so brute beasts, but in respect of their bodies and minds.' [227] To Mercer, man and woman should be one less in the body and more in the union of their minds; St. Bonaventure stressed the necessity of spiritual union and intellectual love, and Goodman that of 'kind offices and mutual helps.' [228] It had however not been Milton's thought to ignore these customary instructions, but rather to emphasize them by independent treatment, and by assigning them to the angel Raphael. According to Gregory I and St. Bonaventure, following him, one of the functions of Raphael was to warn against the evils of concupiscence: [229]

> [Eve is] fair, no doubt, and worthy well
> Thy cherishing, thy honouring, and thy love;
> Not thy subjection . . . thee her head . . .
> But, if the sense of touch, whereby mankind
> Is propagated, seem such dear delight
> Beyond all other, think the same voutsafed
> To cattle and each beast. . . . What higher
> In her society thou find'st . . . love still:
> In loving thou dost well; in passion not,
> Wherein true love consists not. Love . . . hath
> His seat / In Reason . . . is judicious, is the scale
> By which to Heavenly Love thou may'st ascend,
> Not sunk in carnal pleasure; for which cause
> Among the beasts no mate for thee was found.[230]

'marriage, worthy of the happiness of Paradise, should have had desirable fruit without the shame of lust, had there been no sin.'

[226] Calvin, pp. 95, 128 ff.

[227] Willet, p. 39.

[228] Mercer, p. 70; Bonaventure, IV, d. XXVI; Goodman, pp. 255 ff.; P. L., IV, 727 ff. See also Calvin, p. 129; Diodati, p. 5.

[229] Gregory I, In Evang. Hom. XXXIV, 9; Bonaventure, Centiloquium, III, 18.

[230] VIII, 568 ff. Willet, p. 37, and Du Bartas, VI, 1091 ff., followed their discussions of human cohabitation with references to 'unnatural conjunctions.'

By way of emphasizing further Raphael's counsel, Milton caused Adam to repeat its major points:

> Neither her outside formed so fair, nor aught
> In procreation, common to all kinds . . .
> So much delights me as those graceful acts,
> Those thousand decencies, that daily flow
> From all her words and actions, mixed with love
> And sweet compliance, which declare unfeigned
> Union of mind, or in us both one soul.[231]

Included within or at times suggested by Milton's lines are a number of themes sacred to the general tradition to which these lines belonged: the high place accorded intellect or reason (God's image in man),[232] the beliefs that man was the ruler of woman and should not be directed or controlled by her,[233] that he should rule her gently, cherish and protect her, and that woman was not the servant but the helper, comforting companion, and inspiring associate of man.[234]

D

It is the judgment of contemporary Miltonic criticism that Books XI and XII of Paradise Lost, taken as a whole, are the least stimulating and significant of the twelve which form the

[231] VIII, 596 ff. To this passage is appended the often criticized inquiry concerning the love of angels. Among others, this question is discussed by St. Bonaventure, II, d. III, p. ii, art. 3; St. Thomas, I, 60; and by Beaumont, VI, 219. Beaumont's description follows immediately that of the love of Adam and Eve.

[232] P. L., V, 101–102, 486–487; VII, 507–508; IX, 351–352, 654. Cf. Ainsworth, p. 7; Basil, De Hominis Structura, I, 4 ff.; Damascene, De Duabus Voluntatibus, sec. 28; Du Bartas, VI, 517 ff., Furies, ll. 333 ff., Imposture, l. 501; More, Antimonopsychia, st. 2; Peter Lombard, II, d. XVI, 3; Philo, On the . . . World's Creation, XXI, XXV, XLVIII ff.; Ralegh, p. 19; Swan, p. 493; Wolleb-Ross, pp. 36 ff., 50. Philo wrote in part (XXV), that God 'made man partaker of kinship with Himself in mind and reason, best of all gifts.' We also may compare Philo's conception, ibid., XLIII: 'Conscience, established in the soul like a judge . . . administering reproofs,' with Milton's idea, III, 194 ff., that within man God 'will place . . . as a guide, my umpire Conscience.' For the views of other Fathers, including Origen and Augustine, see Robbins, pp. 32 ff.

[233] P. L., IV, 297 ff., 637 ff.; IX, 1183 ff.; X, 151 ff. Cf. Diodati, p. 5; Goodman, p. 256; Grotius, Adam, V; Quarles, Esther, Med. 3; Ralegh, p. 60; Swan, p. 493; Willet, pp. 35 ff.

[234] P. L., IV, 298 ff., 308 ff., 498 ff.; IX, 318 ff., and passim. Cf. Babington, p. 14; Calvin, pp. 128 ff.; Mercer, pp. 61, 66 ff.; Swan, ibid.; Tostatus, XIII, 372 ff., especially 377; Willet, pp. 21, 36.

epic.[235] We may question however if this were the verdict of educated Christian readers perhaps as late as 1750. Among many others, works utilizing much the same subject-matter had been written by Augustine, Caedmon, Du Bartas, Peyton, and Valmarana, not to mention the legion of commentaries on Genesis and other books of Scripture, or its inclusion in histories, as with Ralegh, in poetry, as in Cowley's Davidëis, and in geography, as in Peter Heylyn's Cosmography.[236] When Ralegh used the word *memorable* in the caption, 'Memorable things between the Fall of Adam and the Flood of Noah,' he suggested accurately the interest of his contemporaries in amplified paraphrases of Biblical history. There was indeed good reason why the Divine Weekes and Workes of Du Bartas should have reached in approximately fifty years more than two hundred and thirty editions, thirty-eight of which were in English translation.[237] During the Sixteenth and Seventeenth

[235] Since the time of Bentley (Paradise Lost, XI, 387 ff.; new ed., London, 1732, pp. 360–361), various editors and critics have found particularly offensive the catalogue of cities and empires of XI, 384 ff. In the vision inspired by Michael, Adam passed in turn from Asia to Africa, to Europe, and at the last to America:

> From the destined walls / Of Cambalu . . .
> The empire of the Negus to his utmost port . . .
> On Europe thence, and where Rome was to sway
> The world: in spirit perhaps he also saw
> Rich Mexico, the seat of Montezume. . . .

We may recall however that in his Psyche, XVI, 100–104, Joseph Beaumont devoted five stanzas to a not dissimilar catalogue:

> (Caption: A Brief History of Events.)
> Heroic were these spectacles . . .
> The first, subdued Asia did display . . .
> The second, generous Europe did present . . .
> Hot sandy Africk boiled in the third,
> The fourth, was but prophetic yet, in which
> Deciphered was a strange, untutored world,
> In golden mines, and veins of silver rich. . . .

[236] Augustine, City of God, XV–XXII; Caedmon, pp. 59 ff.; Du Bartas, Second Week; Peyton, II, 1 ff. (through the Flood); Valmarana, Bks. IV ff.; Ralegh, pp. 61 ff.; Cowley, Bks. I–IV, passim; Heylyn, pp. 1 ff. As Milton did later, Valmarana described Michael as sent to Paradise to eject Adam and Eve, and as instructing Adam concerning future events of Biblical history. I shall discuss in another place the many similarities between the Demonomachiae and Paradise Lost.

[237] Cf. H. Ashton, Du Bartas en Angleterre, Paris, 1908, p. 61 and appendix; Thibaut, p. 57.

Centuries, by far the most popular book for commentary, for literary paraphrase, and for incidental use was Genesis.[238] The major interest, as in Paradise Lost, IV, VII–IX, was in the three opening chapters; the secondary and tertiary on events from the Fall to the Flood, and from the Flood to the conclusion. The Book of Exodus, a poor second to Genesis, apparently received somewhat more attention than subsequent books of the Old Testament. The 490 lines which Milton devoted to personages and happenings from the Fall to the Flood, the 163 lines allotted to the remainder of Genesis, the 97 to Exodus, and the brief passages given to other books, reflect not inaccurately the proportional variations of contemporary interest.

There is much truth in our conventional interpretation that in Paradise Lost, XI–XII, Milton followed the Bible. It is however more exact to say that in the major part of these books he frequently followed various interpretations of Scripture as found in commentary and literary paraphrase. It was such works, not Genesis 4. 8, which supported his statement that Cain slew Abel with a stone,[239] and his implication that prior to the deed Cain dissembled or concealed his anger.[240] A second illustration is the emphasis which he placed upon Jubal and Tubal-Cain, mentioned in passing in Genesis 4. 21–22 as 'the father of all such as handle the harp and pipe,' and 'the forger of every cutting instrument of brass and iron.' [241] Genesis says but little of Enoch or of Nimrod, and does not describe the latter as leader of those who erected the tower of Babel. In harmony with much of the commentary literature, Milton

[238] Cf. the Catalogue of the British Museum; Pollard and Redgrave, Short Title Catalogue; and Arnold Williams, loc. cit., pp. 191 ff.

[239] P. L., XI, 445 ff. Cf. Cedrenus, p. 16; Cowley, p. 247; Du Bartas, Handicrafts, ll. 321 ff.; Syncellus, p. 19; Willet, pp. 61 ff. Mercer stated, p. 112, that some writers hold that Cain killed Abel with a stone; others, with other weapons, and concluded that there are a thousand ways of inflicting death. Milton followed his description of the slaying of Abel by depicting what he called 'the many shapes of death.' Du Bartas, Furies, ll. 235 ff., described in detail what he termed 'a thousand deaths.'

[240] P. L., XI, 444. Cf. Du Bartas, ibid.; Willet, ibid.

[241] P. L., XI, 556 ff. Cf. Ainsworth, p. 24; Caedmon, p. 66; Calvin, pp. 205 ff.; Du Bartas, ibid., ll. 525 ff.; Mercer, p. 122; Mersenne, col. 1514; Valmarana, pp. 219, 356.

stressed both characters, and made the latter the chief or a chief builder of Babel.[242]

In view of the poet's deep hatred of oppression, nothing in the whole of Paradise Lost appears more personal and spontaneous than the digression on tyrants and tyranny which follows his account of Nimrod. Milton unquestionably believed all that he uttered here, but it was nevertheless a tradition to include with description of the tyrannical Nimrod a discussion or condemnation of tyranny.[243] It was also the commentaries and related literature which described Abraham as 'bred up in idol-worship.'[244] Had the poet followed Genesis, and Genesis alone, he would have written with Caedmon (p. 104) that God called Abraham, not at Ur of Chaldea, but at Haran, and that the Patriarch had resided at Haran for some years before he departed to seek the 'land unknown.'[245] In extended portions of Books XI–XII, as indeed in much of Paradise Lost, Milton utilized conceptions and patterns both well-established and more or less commonplace.[246]

[242] (1) Enoch: P. L., XI, 664 ff. Cf. Ainsworth, p. 27; Caedmon, pp. 72–73; Du Bartas, ibid., ll. 697 ff.; Valmarana, pp. 326, 353; Willet, p. 74. (2) Nimrod and Babel: P. L., XII, 24 ff. Cf. Ainsworth, p. 44; Du Bartas, Babylon, ll. 39 ff.; Mercer, p. 214; Pererius, XV, 54 ff.; Rupertus, De Trinitate, IV, 43; Syncellus, pp. 67, 77; Tostatus, X, 6, and XI, 4; Willet, pp. 116 ff.

[243] P. L., XII, 79 ff. Cf. Ainsworth, ibid.; Calvin, p. 317; Du Bartas, Babylon, ll. 13 ff.; Mercer, ibid.; Willet, ibid. Rupertus, ibid., and Syncellus, p. 67, mention Nimrod's tyranny.

[244] P. L., XII, 115 ff. Cf. Ainsworth, p. 2; Du Bartas, Vocation, ll. 79 ff.; Willet, pp. 134 ff. Other writers, such as Syncellus, p. 184, and Pererius XVI, 255, maintained that Abraham did not worship the idols of Terah his father.

[245] P. L., XII, 120 ff. The place where God called Abraham was a matter of much controversy. The Calling in Chaldea, adopted by Milton, was supported by Du Bartas, ibid.; Mercer, p. 241; Pererius, XV ff. (ed. cit., pp. 480 ff.); Ralegh, p. 41; Syncellus, p. 175; Willet, p. 139. A number of writers compromised as to the place, and described Abraham as called neither at Ur of Chaldea nor at Haran, as Augustine, City of God, XVI, 15, or as called at both, as Ainsworth, p. 49, and Tostatus, XII. Augustine's conclusion is based upon his interpretation of the account of Stephen, Acts 7. 2–3, according to which Abraham was called in Mesopotamia before he reached the city of Haran.

[246] I shall discuss in a volume in preparation the light which Milton's use of commonplace patterns and sequences throws upon his methods of composition and creative processes.

IV

In the preceding sections I have not attempted to discuss all the primary and secondary themes found in Paradise Lost, including a number for which analogues have been collected.[247] Neither have I presented all available parallels for the themes which have been considered.[248] However, the evidence discussed above appears adequate to support the conclusion that contemporary interpretation and criticism of Paradise Lost contain much that is incomplete. We should so qualify the statement that the epic is modelled upon Homer and Virgil as to indicate that for the most part its major divisions and episodes, as well as its ideas, were drawn from the related literature of Christian writers. Equally necessary is some modification of the often repeated statement that the Satan of Paradise Lost was the creation of Milton. The poet made Satan, as he made all other things in the epic, more magnificent, more compelling, than did his contemporaries. As Shakespeare had done with Hamlet,

[247] Among the more obvious lacunae is a discussion of the relative conventionality of Milton's attitude toward predestination. The reason for this omission is that I have been unable to reach a conclusion as to what, in Paradise Lost, is the poet's precise belief. In his most extended discussion of the doctrine, III, 173 ff., Milton divided mankind into three classes, the first of which God arbitrarily predestined to salvation. This conception, based upon such passages as Romans 8. 29–30; 9. 22–23; 11. 29; 2 Timothy 2. 20; and Titus 3. 5, appears to have been an orthodox commonplace of both Protestant and Roman Catholic thought. The second class of men, which was called and induced by God to repent, seemingly represents such an addition to the elect as was suggested by one translation of Deuteronomy 1. 11: 'The Lord God adds to this number many thousands.' (Cf. St. Thomas, Sum. Theol. I, 23, 7.) The third group, called by God, but not induced by Him to repent, is the reprobate. Their calling without the enlightenment and the softening of heart accorded the second group was supported by Matthew 22. 14: 'Many are called, but few are chosen'. The portions of Milton's discussion at times regarded as peculiarly Arminian may not unprofitably be compared with Ambrose, gloss on Romans 9. 15: 'I will give mercy to him who, I foresee, will turn to me with his whole heart'; with Damascene, De Fide Orthod., II, 30; and with Thomas Aquinas, I, 23, 8 (glossing 2 Peter 1. 10): 'The predestined must strive after good works and prayer: because through these means predestination is most certainly fulfilled.' Thomas concluded his discussion of predestination with the statement that 'predestination can be furthered by the creatures, but it cannot be impeded by them.'

[248] In selecting writers from a group too large for citation, I have attempted to choose those who would represent different centuries, different nationalities, and different creeds.

with Macbeth, and with Lear, he achieved a character whose whole was greater than the parts. Yet in essence and in attributes, this character remained that of a conventional and well-established tradition.

In this category may be included the criticism which finds that after their fall into Hell, the worst terror of the devils is inaction. 'Then Satan thinks of Man, and the outlet of energy is provided. . . . Satan hopes to find Eve alone, and *by a lucky chance* he does so.' [249] In any Seventeenth Century work of the genre of Paradise Lost, it was preordained that Satan would think of man immediately subsequent to his fall, and that he would seek and find Eve alone. What is significant in Milton's treatment of these conventional episodes is that which I am sure was believed but not stated by the critic — that they were so presented as to create an atmosphere of verisimilitude and a dramatic suspense rarely if ever equalled in the genre. Similar but somewhat more important is the critical inadequacy of two additional interpretations. Of these the first is that 'Pride was the traditional motive for Satan's Fall, and Milton accepts that tradition and pitches on the Exaltation of the Son as the immediate efficient cause.' [250] But Milton does not so much pitch upon Christ's Exaltation as he selected both it and the at times related conception that the major conflict was between the Son and Satan. Because he did this, Christ was given more prominence, and the epic made different from what it otherwise would have been. The second interpretation is the received opinion that the principal and basic conceptions of Paradise Lost were peculiar either to Evangelical Protestantism, or to Protestantism in general. Viewed as a whole, the ideas of Paradise Lost were then as much Roman Catholic as they were Protestant; in some instances more so.

It is the further belief of our two most distinguished and influential interpreters of Milton, Professors Tillyard and Grierson, that Paradise Lost is a basically pessimistic arraignment of the triviality of mankind. In varying degrees both

[249] E. M. W. Tillyard, Milton, London, 1930, pp. 245, 253.

[250] Sir Herbert J. C. Grierson, Milton and Wordsworth, Cambridge, 1937, p. 116.

connect this assumed pessimism with personal disillusionment resulting from the failure of the Commonwealth. The thesis that Paradise Lost is pessimistic, Professor Tillyard supports by calling attention to 'Satan's anguished impotence at the beginning, . . . the warning lines at the beginning of Book Four, . . . [and] the description of Paradise, which has in it the hopeless ache for the unattainable.' Continuing, he states that pessimism 'comes out strongest of all in the last four books. There is a dreadful sense of the wrongness of things in the approach of action in the Ninth Book: "O much deceav'd, much failing, hapless Eve" . . . .' [251] In addition, Professor Tillyard finds the first books of the epic stronger than the last, in part for the reason that Milton's pessimism has here penetrated the texture of the verse.[252]

To the present writer, there is little evidence of personal pessimism in the use of such expected commonplaces as Satan's anguish, the idyllic utopian description of Paradise, or emphasis upon the point that Eve was much deceived. The robust warning against Satan has been and still may be heard from many pulpits. The tonal shading and treatment of these commonplaces is of course another matter, and may support adequately the interpretation that Paradise Lost is the pessimistic creation of a writer who had grown pessimistic. It is however in point to recall that where critics of earlier periods described the literary renaissance of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries with the word *joyous*, critics of the post-war era frequently have replaced this word with its opposites, *pessimistic* and *despairing*.[253] With the inclusion of Milton among those who fell before despair, the most distinguished hundred years of English literature has become, not the Century of Genius,

[251] Op. cit., pp. 284–285.

[252] Ibid., p. 291. Professor Grierson, op. cit., p. 114, agrees with Professor Tillyard that the first books are the stronger, but holds that this resulted from Milton's having worked here untrammelled by Biblical or ecclesiastical tradition. It appears however that Milton was as faithful to religious tradition in the books which open the epic as he was in those which close it.

[253] See especially the excellent studies of Professors George Williamson, 'Mutability, Decay, and Seventeenth-Century Melancholy,' ELH, II (1935), 121–150; and Don Cameron Allen, 'The Degeneration of Man and Renaissance Pessimism,' SP, XXXV (1938), 202–227.

but a period of pessimistic genius.[254] It goes without saying that those who have exploded the 'myth of the joyous renaissance' have rendered inestimable service to scholarship. Nevertheless, should we regard pessimism as the dominant note of a highly creative period, we may limit our contribution to the exchange of one disproportion for another. Nor can the fact be ignored that it is our own confused generation which chiefly has stressed the despair and pessimism of the literary era which closed with Milton.

This is not the place to examine in detail the cogently argued contention of Professor Grierson that Paradise Lost is not prophetic but artistic and didactic; not intuitive but rational, and that Milton's defense of Divine Providence is too purely legal.[255] We should recognize however that both this defense and the major ideas of the epic were commonplaces of long standing, far too old and too well-known to have sprung from individual ratiocination. Conversely, the ideas and episodes which Milton selected for his great poem necessarily had an emotional, or if one prefers the related word, an intuitive basis. Nor is it impossible that the high value which a Christian artist placed upon the conceptions he set forth would stimulate him to adorn them as his Creator was said to have adorned the world.

I would conclude that Paradise Lost gave artistic-prophetic utterance to beliefs both sacred and vital to Milton, and that he conceived of his poem as a universal religious epic which would justify the ways of the Christian God.

[254] If it has not been said, as much perhaps could be said of the next great era of English poetry, that which extended from Burns through Tennyson.

[255] Op. cit., p. 96. See also p. 94, and passim.